National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXI. NO. 1. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 19, 1860. WHOLE NO. 1,041.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,
AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At its Office, No. 5 Beekman Street, New York,
AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE
PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
107 N. Fifth St., above Arch, Philadelphia.

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial department of the paper, should be addressed, "EDITOR OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK." Letters relating to subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "PUBLISHER OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK."

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

THE STANDARD.

TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Reported for THE STANDARD by J. M. W. YERRINTON.

[CONTINUED FROM LAST WEEK.]

Speech of Wendell Phillips, Esq.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, Esq., was then introduced, as the last speaker of the morning (Tuesday). He said:

MR. PRESIDENT: I can very sincerely say that I stand with a great deal of pleasure upon this platform this morning. I think we have very peculiar reasons for rejoicing over the position and prospects of the anti-slavery movement. The sky looks clear; the picture seems bright. I am not sure whether there is much necessity for holding such a meeting as this; perhaps we hold too many. Having just finished a very interesting and excited session of the American Society at Charleston (laughter and applause), and looking forward to another interesting debate at Chicago next week, by other agents and servants of this Society (renewed merriment), perhaps we do wrong in wearying the people by filling up this interval with a meeting of our own. Still, after all, I suppose it is necessary that we also, in unmistakable tone, should express our opinion about current events. I am glad to stand here, therefore; glad at the presence of those who stand with us. I think we have heard the John Brown of the American pulpit this morning (loud applause); and I should be disposed to say, with Mrs. Browning,

"Shout for the good sword's ring!
Shout for the thought still truer!"

I go for the sword; but I go for the thought which ploughs deeper and lasts longer than the sword-blade in a reading and thinking nation like ours.

I have, I think, a right to call my predecessor the John Brown of the American pulpit; for the "Church of the Puritans" is in insurrection to-day (loud laughter and applause). Union Square is the Harper's Ferry of the moral conflict (renewed applause); and the vulture of American Congregationalism is to swoop upon him as the vulture of the American Union swooped upon the heroes of Charlestown and Harper's Ferry, five or six months ago. I am glad he comes here, and—like kindred drops mingling into one—that [illegible] righteousness gravitates toward the platform of the American Anti-Slavery Society (applause). The only trouble is, in gleaning after such reapers, to find anything to say.

But the sky grows bright. We have had a great many dissolutions of the Union. The Methodists divided North and South awhile ago; the Missionary Society is broken in pieces—we have two or three claimants for public sympathy and support; the Tract Society has a fragment at Boston and a fragment at New York. Everything is breaking, and at last the great Democratic party has broken too (laughter and loud cheering). She has found out that slavery has a right everywhere. She hated the Republican motto, "Freedom national, Slavery sectional"; she had her motto, "Slavery everywhere"; and the counterpart is "Democracy nowhere" (great merriment). It reminds me of the story an Eastern traveller tells us of a bear in Northern Asia, who went into a woman's hut when she had just taken off the boiling tea-kettle; and, smelling round with his nose, he touched the hot iron. Angry at the offence offered to his nervous system, the bear clasped the kettle; the more it burned him, the more he howled; and the more he howled, the tighter he clasped it; and so he died. The Democratic party clasped slavery everywhere; and the more it has ruined it, the more it has clasped it, and the more it has howled (laughter); and it will die with the hot doctrine in its arms (applause).

What says the other party? How much does it say? Why, Mr. Seward has found out a new name for the conflict—an "irrepressible conflict"; and has found out a new name for the parties. Mark you! we are fanatics; we don't know anything; we are head over heels with our passions; we can't see an inch beyond our own ignorance and mistake; we are mere boys—madmen—strong-minded women, meddling with what don't concern them—and this is the statesman who instructs us how to think. Well, there is an "irrepressible conflict." Between what? "Between labor and capital." Where did he find that? An "irrepressible conflict" between the lungs and the stomach; an "irrepressible conflict" betwixt the air and the lungs. An "irrepressible conflict between labor and capital"! And is that statesmanship? Yet this is the doctrine of the Republican party; this is the statesmanship of the Republican party. Words mean a great deal, and that speech undertakes to use words as Talleyrand told us their highest use was—to conceal thought. What is the cause, according to Mr. Seward, of all this difficulty? The history of the Union—what is the cause of it? Why that the North was afraid of losing the Union. One—two—three—he traces every act of Southern aggression. Why did it succeed? Because the North was afraid of losing the Union. A compassionate woman once asked the doctor you know, "Doctor, why is it that men are born dumb?" "Well, madam," said the learned physician, gathering up the whole sum of his logic, "the reason of that is that children are born without speech" (laughter). "Well, now, I am so glad I asked you," said she. "I suppose if I had asked my husband, he would have said, 'Because they is'" (renewed laughter). That is the amount of that speech. No explanation: no analysis: no piercing into the real causes that make the North afraid of losing the Union, or make the Union valuable, or its sundering hazardous. No; when a keen question, like an earthquake rift, that goes down to the very heart of the nation, enters the Senate chamber, in the person of Thaddeus Hyatt, this Republican statesman goes out of the door cries of "Shame". Is there not need, then, of such meetings as ours? Is there not need of men, insurrectionists against Church and State, bold at least to tell all they think and fear? Suppose men say we do nothing but scold our neighbors; suppose men say we do nothing but exhaust the vocabulary of abuse; suppose that men say we do nothing but manifest the morbid bitterness of our own envious spirits; such things have been said before. The old party from which we spring bore the same calumny in their day; yet they saved England and survived, gibbeted to everlasting contempt in the undying satire of Hudibras and the scorn of *belles lettres* ever since; and, like the Covenanters, as the Scotch poet says:

"—— bought,
Stern rushing upon tyrant's spears,
The freedom and the scorn of after years."

We may buy it too; but whether we buy it or not, our duty at such hours as this is to see that the Republic receives no detriment, no matter whose chances for the Presidency are perilled by the discussion, the remorseless discussion, of the question which the hour raises.

I agree with Dr. Cheever utterly in the opinion which he has been almost the first in this city of the Empire to avow, in regard to this doctrine of contempt. No man who understands the nature of our government but would see, in a moment, that, according to the whole spirit of the United States Constitution, neither in the Senate as a Court nor in any court under republican institutions does there abide one shadow of this despotic usurpation, the right to commit for contempt. We did not bring it over to these States. We no more brought it than we brought the king's privilege of taking your houses and eating all you have, without paying for it, as the Tudors and the Stuarts did for hundreds of years. It is a relic of despotism, which nothing but the servile indifference or the timidity of the Republican members of the Senate ever allowed to exist for a moment. The Senate has a right, if a man disturb its sessions by unseemly noise, to put him out; when he is out of that hall, he falls, as every criminal does, into the hands of the police and the grand jury. If he has offended the laws of his country the courts are open, indictment is ready, a petit jury for his trial, the State's prison for his punishment: and no Republican Legislature, and no Republican Court, sitting under the Constitution of the Union or the State, possesses any power beyond that. It is a usurpation of judges and statesmen; and every republican citizen who does not wish slavery to be no longer a matter of color, but to cover us, the Saxon race, as well as the negro, is bound to put his foot upon this first and most atrocious instance of Senatorial usurpation (loud cheers). If *The Tribune* had not had its heart eaten out by the miserable chances of Republican success, it might have made some effort to give the key-note to the Northern press in regard to this outrage on citizenship, broader even than chattel slavery itself.

You may say that I use strong language, speaking of Republican shortcomings. I do, and I mean to do so. Slavery is no superficial evil, that is to be killed in a moment, or by a single blow. It is grooted into the very machinery of the State; it strikes its roots through a thousand strata, and is as powerful and more powerful than the Union itself. Many men have thought they saw it dying, and have supposed that they should survive it, and been disappointed. John Randolph said, thirty years ago, "Slavery is so weak in Virginia that I shall yet live to see the slave chasing his master for a support, and the master trying to avoid his slave." After he made the prophecy, slavery stepped over the Mississippi, stole new lands upon which to plant itself, and took a new lease for another half century. To-day, Republicanism lays down the delusive principle, that if slavery can be curbed in the Territories, and confined to the worn-out soil of Virginia and the Carolinas, it will die of itself. But in the meantime, a great commercial agent and agricultural discovery, guano, is undertaking to renew the exhausted life of the Carolinas and of Georgia, and ten dollars laid out upon one acre give a result of sixty or seventy clear profit to the worn-out soil of the seaboard; and one little discovery like this agricultural patent of the last ten years is to make the whole machinery of republican argument useless and baseless. It is only another stone in the structure which we have been striving to rear for a quarter of a century, that no efficient attack can be made upon the system of slavery which does not denounce it as sin, which does not claim its abolition as a duty, which does not demand, on a higher level than expediency, that of Christian principle, of thirty million of people, that they put to it a total, an unconditional and an immediate end! (Loud applause.)

It is said that we have claimed too much; that we have unnecessarily invaded the religious world, and attacked it. Do you believe that if thirty thousand American pulpits had preached for three years as this one Doctor of Divinity has preached to us this morning, South Carolina could whip New York into being her spaniel at Charleston? (Voices—"No!" "No!") "Political preaching"! When Christ announced to his hearers his doctrines as to the sinfulness and the fate of the men on whom the tower of Siloam fell, he was preaching to them about the last news of that morning, which the boys had hawked about the streets of Jerusalem that very day. He took for his text an extract from *The Jerusalem Observer* (laughter) of that very week, and preached on the last political and social item of the hour; and no man follows in his footsteps that does not do exactly the same thing. When I want political preaching, I go to the New Testament, which is nothing but a political pamphlet, suited to the meridian of Jerusalem. If the Church had [illegible] doctrine on the subject of the sinfulness of slavery, we should have settled this question ten years ago, on a deeper and better basis than any that politics can offer to us. When I look upon a Republican statesman covering himself up, for availability, in equivocal words, in timid announcements of principle, it throws me back to the consideration, what have we fanatics ever asked? How much have we ever claimed? Justice? As my friend Robert Purvis stood here, and spoke to us of the colored race, it came to me, How lacking we have been—we, the "madmen" of the Abolition crusade! We have claimed for the slave, peeled and meeted out, plundered and wronged for six generations—we have claimed for the imbruted representative of a race that has made one-half of this nation what it is, that, naked and penniless, ignorant and friendless, he should go out without fetters. That magnificent house, grouted with his blood—those timbers, laid in his toil—that Southern boy's education, whipped out of his muscles—that girl's diamonds, crushed out of his bones—that white race's culture on the sweat of his brow—that Eden of the Carolinas and Virginia, the result of his toil—of that we have asked not one jot nor tittle; but from under that avalanche of wickedness, we have only asked liberty to take out the naked, plundered body of the imbruted representative of six generations of bondmen, and forty thousand pulpits have started back and turned fossil at the atrocity of our claim! (Laughter and cheers.) If we had asked for justice, we should have said, "Senator Mason, dressed in home-spun, disgorge the plunder of your pocket! Throw off that stolen dress, and walk out on the plundered pavement the naked robber that you were born!" (Tremendous cheering.) We should have said to him, when he told Charles Sumner, with laughable ignorance, that he never heard of Virgil till he came to the Senate, "Of course not; who ever expected you to hear of Virgil in benighted Virginia?" Had I stood in the Massachusetts Senator's place I should have offered a resolution that the ignorant Senator from Virginia be furnished with a copy of Virgil at the public expense; and, in order to facilitate his acquisition of knowledge, that it be the Hamiltonian edition, where the English line follows the Latin (loud laughter). But I should have said to the educated Virginian, "Free that slave immediately! Clothe him; educate him; send him to Yale or to Harvard; flood his soul with the culture which the best institutions of learning can give him; bring him home, clothe him with broadcloth and velvet, and, on your bended knees at his feet, beg him, accepting of all you have, to pardon the name of robber that you have inherited by six generations of disgrace!" (Loud cheers.) And if the Abolitionists had claimed it all, in the face of thirty millions of people, every line in this inspired book (taking up the Bible) would have vindicated the title and stood for the basis of the enterprise (renewed applause). And yet, when we only claim a flavor, a homeopathic pellet, an almost infinitesimal fraction of the slave's rights, press and pulpit, statesmanship and literature cry out, "The heavens are going to pieces; the earth yawns at our feet! Lo! we are a Christian nation. Behold this imbruted infidel, who maintains that the Bible does not sanction Virginia in selling every sixth man, and condemning every sixth woman to prostitution!"

My good friend Dr. Cheever thinks we have another sin to answer for; and that is, we libel the American Constitution. Well, all I can say is, I will share in the fault betwixt the Americans that are and the Americans that have been. I was afraid, in the present state of American vitality, that if we put the whole load of the sin upon our shoulders, it would crush us entirely out, and so I called Washington and Jefferson, Patrick Henry and Judge Jay to help us bear up the load. He says I do them injustice. All I can say is, that if the Constitution is good, and if the present captain and the present crew, with a spotless deck and unsullied ship's papers, started on a cruise, and turned us into such pirates, then the crew and the captain are a great deal worse than I supposed them. If with a spotless Constitution we have got such a Union, where, in the devil's name, should we have been if we had had a bad Constitution? (Laughter and loud cheers.) I think the fault is in the Constitution, and that the sons have been merely moving in the channel and rut that the fathers made for them; that it is in our blood; that this constitutional principle of compromising is not only constitutional in the sense of the American parchment, but it is physically our constitution. The North and the South, on this subject of slavery, are like two boys that went out in Boston on election day. One said, "How much money has your father given you?" "He has given me twenty-five cents," said the other. "How much has your father given you?" "He has given me ninepence: let's divide" (laughter). The North and the South started with the Constitution, with the idea that we should put our culture, wealth, thrift, enterprise, righteousness, Christianity, into this rotten partnership of a slave Democracy, and we agreed to it. Washington and Jefferson knew it. My good friend asks, with an eloquence all his own, "Who can believe that Washington ever let them foist into the Constitution of the United States that damnable provision to bring back a fugitive slave?" Well, I do not know that he did; but I know that when it was there, he used it. Whether he consented to its being foisted in I do not know: but after it was in, even George Washington—can I speak a purer or a better name in that generation?—even George Washington could send to New Hampshire (Charles Sumner read the letter on the floor of the United States Senate), and ask the collector of customs at Portsmouth to bring back to Mount Vernon the slave that had sought the free air of the White hills, and was breathing it contrary to law. But let it be said to the immortal honor of the great Virginian, that he added, "if the attempt to take her back will offend the prejudices of the farmers of New Hampshire, do not attempt to do it" (loud applause). Would to God that the prejudices of the farmers of New Hampshire could have crowded out the prejudices of South Carolina! But, unfortunately, the prejudices of Carolina have choked New England.

What poetic justice it was that on the very steamship which the Democratic party hired to carry them to Charleston and to bring them back, a fugitive slave concealed himself! And on the return voyage—as it were God's own manifest hand held out to [illegible]—he was discovered. The infamous blots on the surface of American life put back the steamer and returned him to bondage ("shame"). Thank God, the Democracy is annihilated! (Great cheering.) You remember the old story of the bar-room bully, who said that he knocked his antagonist down with such a blow that there was nothing left of him. The next morning, they brought a light and found a grease spot—that was all! The Democratic party has been annihilated; they have brought a light, and all they can find is a "Constitutional party" in New England, Edward Everett and Caleb Cushing! (Great merriment.) Somebody says I should speak respectfully of Cushing. Oh, no! It was whispered that I ought to be respectful—he might be President of the United States. That is no reason. Any man is in danger of being President of the United States (laughter). But I don't think they will try Cushing. Out at Pelham, where the Monadnock mountain hangs over the sanctuary, the old minister was once preaching on faith, and said he, "My brethren, if you had faith, you might move a mountain." Then he glanced up and saw Monadnock, shook his head, and added, "Not exactly Monadnock, but a very large hill" (merriment). Now, I don't think the Democratic horse in the race could quite carry Caleb Cushing, though I think he might win with the "Little Giant" in the saddle. But that is no business of ours.

I am glad that I came here so late that it was unnecessary I should say anything in addition to the weighty and grave truth, to the eloquent and stern truth, to which we have listened this morning. Thank God that better men are crowding us off our own platform—doing our work better, perhaps, than we can do it ourselves! It is a hard fight; it is a brave battle. Mr. Seward knows it, better than you and I do. He does not mean that speech; he means something infinitely deeper (applause). He knows it, and the slaveholder knows it. He knows that when he goes into the Presidential chair, if he shall go there, with that speech in his right hand, he carries this whole platform in his heart (cheers). He knows, and every man of his age (for he has reached that age when men begin to act less from ambition and more from a sense of duty), every Republican leader knows, that the programme they announced in the Senate is not the purpose of the Northern people, is not the purpose of the Republican party, that has the heart of the Northern people behind it; but that, throwing aside these words, surmounting these historical problems, Wm. H. Seward designs, and the Republican party, so far as it has a heart, means to grapple slavery, and to strangle it so soon as they can (enthusiastic cheering). Our friend Dr. Cheever said, "Put me in the place of power, and I will make that Constitution anti-slavery." Yes: make him President, and, as Alexander of Russia said to Madame de Staël, "I am the Constitution" (applause), and under such a constitution, neither my friend Mr. Garrison nor myself might find any conscientious scruples against voting (renewed applause). When Wm. H. Seward enters the Presidential chair, he means that his portrait, if it lives to posterity, shall go down painted with one hand on the American eagle and the other on the jugular vein of the slave system (prolonged and enthusiastic cheering, and cries of "good," "good") The fault I find with Republicans is that they are such children, that they are such infants, as to suppose that, with their past behind them, and with their future looking out of their eyes, either the slave-holder or the abolitionist believes the lies that they call speeches (laughter and cheers). Emerson said, a "speech is not worth anything that has not a man behind it." Do you suppose, when Jefferson Davis and Mr. Mason listened to that speech of Wm. H. Seward, that they were green enough to believe that they were listening to the opinions of the senate? Do you believe that they know us so little, that they read the New York *Herald* and *The Tribune* so carelessly as to suppose that the silent North waited, hushed and anxious, until its vagrant statesman came back from Jerusalem to tell them what to think and to feel, and that, when he came, this useless parade of the dictionary was all the message they expected? Do you suppose that when—paying that inestimable price for the gewgaw of the Presidency (poor man! how bankrupt he will be if he does not get it!)—do you think that when his lips, upon which the civilized world was waiting, soiled themselves by saying that a better man than he, that John Brown, was "justly hung," the South supposed, for a moment, that the free waters of the Empire State stood still to hearken to the voice of her statesman, because he thought that gibbet at Charlestown was legal and just? No, the South paid him the compliment of believing that he lied (loud laughter and applause). They knew that the statesman of sixteen States must have other metal than that, or he never could have endowed himself with magnetism enough to draw sixteen million of hearts. Now, what Mr. Seward cannot say in the Senate, the other end of the telegraph says here. Here Dr. Cheever lets the cat out of the bag! (Prolonged cheers.)

The Convention then adjourned to meet at 3 o'clock, in business session.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON.

At the business meeting of the Society, held at the Cooper Institute, at 3 o'clock, p.m., the chair was taken by the President of the Society.

Samuel May, Jr., of Massachusetts, and Susan B. Anthony, of New York, were chosen Assistant Secretaries.

The question of amending the Constitution, in conformity to notice already given to the Executive Committee, was brought before the Society. The proposed amendments are as follows:

By striking out of Article II. the following words: "While it admits that each State, in which slavery exists, has, by the Constitution of the United States, the exclusive right to *legislate* in regard to its abolition in said State," and by making the word "It," which follows the words above quoted, the beginning of a sentence.

Also that the reading of the first sentence of the same article shall be, "The object of this Society is," &c.

The first amendment was favored by Oliver Johnson, Wendell Phillips, Wm. H. Hoisington, J. Miller McKim, J. H. Stephenson, Edward W. Gilbert, Susan B. Anthony, Mary Grew, and the President. Adopted, *nem. con.*

The second amendment was then unanimously agreed to.

The following persons were nominated by the Chair, and elected, a Committee to nominate officers for the ensuing year.

Committee to nominate Officers.—J. Miller McKim, of Philadelphia; Marcus Spring, of New Jersey; Thomas Garrett, of Delaware; G. B. Stebbins, of Michigan; Maria E. Whitcomb, of Connecticut; J. Elizabeth Jones, of Ohio; J. H. Stephenson, of Massachusetts; Joseph Post, of New York; Joseph Carpenter, of New York.

Mr. May read letters, addressed to the Executive Committee, from Rev. Beriah Green, Rev. O. B. Frothingham, Rev. M. D. Conway, and Rev. Joshua Young.

The letter of Mr. Frothingham called out remarks from Mr. Garrison, O. Johnson, and Mary Grew.

The following letters were voted to be printed:

LETTER OF REV. M. D. CONWAY.

CINCINNATI, March 16, 1860.

MY DEAR MR. MAY: Your note of the 12th, written for the Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, is before me. I regret that I cannot answer at once, "I go, sir"—it is for fear that, if I did, I might, like the compliant son, "go not." It is better to say, "I go not," and go, perhaps. All I can say now is, *I* [illegible] *try*. And you may be sure of hearing, if I do, the outpourings of a heart which has many a time longed for the Old Abington or Framingham Grove, or the Melodeon, or some other place consecrated to freedom, where it might utter what the events of the last years have made into a molten mass within it.

I have preached several times about Old John Brown, and feel as if I had given only a little crayon study of the picture I wish to, and *can*, draw of that man, to whom my soul cleaves.

I wish to tell also how the limitless prairies, the Rocky Mountains, the wild glory of the twin-valleys of the West, have been crying out to the humanity they are holding at their mighty udders, until man begins to think and throb out here. The Wisconsin Judge who matched his court to the United States and triumphed—Carl Shurtz—John Brown—these are simply our Western baby's fingers feeling about the visage of Slavery. You know the historic destiny of East and West; the East lay a dervish or prophet in the sunshine, dreaming out ideals which the West exists to live out—to incarnate in granite, in government, [illegible]. Practice is the dream of the East—the practical [illegible] the West.

The same thing must be repeated in every nation on a less scale. You in the East are thinking out these matters for us, you lecture us, you inspire us, you give us the poetry and literature of Freedom; but, mark my prophecy! the Thor with the hammer who is to smite the chains, who is to carve the body for the soul of Liberty, now only hovering over this land, he is to be a Western god. I have not yet heard the angel-song, nor seen the star; but the angel of the annunciation has visited our virgin territory. He came in the shape of an old Puritan hero of whom you have heard.

If it is not granted me, in the order of God, to unite with you on the occasion referred to,

"I pray you then
Write me as one who loves his fellow men,"

but hates vermin—institutional, biped, or other—as St. Patrick did, who is his patron saint, he having had the luck to be born on St. Patrick's day. May they all be cast into the Mississippi, and engulfed below its mouths! which will be the case if that river fulfils its mission. Yours, M. D. CONWAY.

In another letter, addressed to a member of the Committee of Arrangements, Mr. Conway says:

"The truth is that every day of my life I get nearer and nearer the regular out-and-out Garrisonian platform: I never work with the Republicans that I don't have to get on the anxious bench soon afterward and repent of some sin they have done, and which I feel imputed to me from that party as a federal head. I find myself repeating,

'In Seward's fall
We sinned all.'

"How much I could say on that Wednesday afternoon! What a good clean breast could I not make of it!"

LETTER OF REV. JOSHUA YOUNG.

BURLINGTON, Vt., March 18, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR: The invitation of the Executive Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society was very gratifying to me, and the thought that, perhaps, I could return an affirmative answer will explain my not replying immediately. But the extreme uncertainty of being able to fulfil the engagement, for reasons of a private nature, forbids my making it.

My sympathies, let me say, are entirely with the noble men who lead the cause of Human Freedom in this land, and, in my humble way and sphere of duty, I am permitted to share with them the honor (which the world means for dishonor) put upon the Abolitionists. To make a public profession of my faith, on the Anti-Slavery platform, agreeable to your invitation, would be a privilege indeed.

The rendition of Anthony Burns and Liberty in Kansas cost me the loss of five of the richest families of [illegible] tan hero, John Brown, has threatened *literally* to shut the door of the church against me—the stockholders' menace giving us, in a new form, the old controversy: MONEY *versus* MAN.

This will, perhaps, surprise you as a voice from the Green Mountains; but you must remember that, after all, Vermont is only a *Republican* State, and has a Redfield for its Chief Justice, whose remarkable letter on Harper's Ferry you have probably seen.

No; the time is not past when the man to whom Liberty is a *principle* must bear the cross. It is only *white men's* liberty that too many mean, who shout freedom most lustily—in Heaven's eye a most godless tyranny! If the poor negro is inferior beneath us, less kindly cared for by Providence than the white man is, then, in Mercy's name, let us have pity on him, and, instead of trampling him down, help him to stand up and to bear his misfortune.

Was there ever an iniquity like the white man's oppression of the black!

With sentiments of esteem for the gentlemen of the Committee, whom I hope soon to know personally, I remain, dear sir, yours for humanity.

JOSHUA YOUNG.

To Samuel May, Jr.,
For Committee of American Anti-Slavery Society.

Two interesting cases of women, one a mulatto, the other to appearance perfectly white, both laboring to collect money for the purpose of redeeming relatives from slavery, were laid before the meeting.

Mr. Johnson, Mr. Garrison, and others, spoke of the many serious objections which lie against buying from the slaveholders their human property.

On motion, the following Committees were nominated and chosen:

On Business: W. L. Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Mary Grew, Martha C. Wright, Oliver Johnson, J. Miller McKim, Jane Elizabeth Jones.

On Finance: Susan B. Anthony, Rowland Johnson, Joshua T. Everett, Giles B. Stebbins, Benjamin Snow, Jr., J. H. Stephenson, James B. Richards.

Adjourned to 7½ o'clock.

TUESDAY EVENING.

The evening session was largely attended, and the meeting was called to order by the President at 7½ o'clock. The first speaker was the Rev. ARTHUR B. BRADFORD, of Newcastle, Pa. He spoke as follows.

Speech of Rev. Arthur B. Bradford.

MR. PRESIDENT: The age in which we live is remarkable for the prevalence of crime. This nation, although younger in years than many persons now living, seems old in guilt. Scarcely out of the swaddling bands of its infancy, when compared with France and England, it is reeling and tottering like a drunken man under the burden of its iniquities. Many wise and patriotic men really fear that our people will throw off all restraint, and go down to atheism in religion, and barbarism in manners. The degeneracy of the populace does not bear with much weight upon the fears of such governments as rule the Old World, because there the people have only the right to submit to laws made for them by their masters. But here the people constitute the fountain of power. Popular sentiment rules the land, laws and constitutions to the contrary notwithstanding. If the fountains, then, become corrupt, they will give character to the streams which flow from them.

Since the conquest of California, there have been 1,400 murders committed in that State, and only two convictions. On a single day in June, 1857, in the two States of Illinois and Missouri, there were 27 men hung for murder. The prisons, County and State, are full of criminals, and the courts of justice are constantly in session, and every Friday in the month the drop of the gallows falls and launches human beings into eternity! Crime seems to run mainly in three channels—breaches of the 6th, 7th and 8th precepts of the Decalogue—*violence, licentiousness, dishonesty*. Many of the murders committed have been to gratify the *amor sceleratus habendi*, which the Scotch interpret, "the hell-fire greed"; or to put out of the way a husband or a wife so as to form a new alliance with a paramour. McKim, who was executed in Pennsylvania a year or two ago, murdered Norcross for his money: Henry Fife and Charlotte Jones murdered Wilson for his money: Hicks, alias Johnson, who is now in the Tombs awaiting his trial for the alleged murder of three men, committed the crime in consideration of a few hundred dollars. In the rural districts of the country it is not safe now for a farmer to allow it to be known that he has a hundred dollars in his house, lest he lose both his money and his life. Rifles and revolvers are getting to be necessary articles in the furniture of our sleeping apartments; and no man knows, when he lies down at night, that he will see the dawn of another day without a battle for his life with an assassin. The virtues, like the sciences, all flourish in the neighborhood of each other, and so do the *vices*. Wherever, therefore, murder, whoredom, and fraud prevail, every other form of evil is present, with its debasing and damning influence. In Church and State, in banking institutions and eleemosynary institutions, in railroad corporations and city corporations, there seems to be an alarming dislocation of morals. Forgery and counterfeiting have become trades, so common that a heavy and successful operator in these lines can brave the odium of his offence, by the *admiration* he receives for the boldness and ingenuity of the act. What but a motive like this could have induced the triple murderer Hicks, to give Barnum a cast of his demoniac countenance to be exhibited in his Museum to the refined public of New York?

Now, it is admitted, because it cannot be denied, that *crime* seems to be the normal condition of human society everywhere and in every age. But what I maintain is, that there ought to be infinitely less in the United States than in any other nation. The freedom of our institutions clothes each citizen with a distinct individuality, and forces into development all those latent faculties that tend to make him not only [illegible] enterprises. This glorious [illegible] also [illegible] safeguard to virtue—for every free citizen feels that the path to wealth and political honor lies open before him. Now, when these things are considered, the present alarming condition of public and private morals in the United States shows that there is something *terribly wrong*.

To make organized battle against the combinations of evil in the world, the Church has been set up as an institution. It professes to be composed of regenerated persons, who swear and pledge themselves in the presence of the heart-searching God to carry out the enterprise entrusted to them by their great Leader. The visible Church is an army of disciplined men, led on by the great Captain of salvation, and is engaged in a specific, definite enterprise, viz.: "*to destroy the works of the devil.*" Never was the grand army of Napoleon better organized and adapted to the conquest of Europe than is a living Church for the conquest of the whole world. Her ministry constitute the officers of the sacramental host, and have a map of the enemy's country, and a plan of the campaign always in their hands. Her *membership* are not *pressed* soldiers, who have no heart for the strife, but *volunteers*, impelled to deeds of bravery by gratitude and holy heroism. The weapons which she uses are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds. The first detachment of this grand army, enlisted on the day of Pentecost, overran the whole Roman Empire before the close of the first century of the Christian era, and eventually trampled down beneath their feet the old institutions of barbarism. But standing armies in time of peace are apt to become *demoralized*. This seems to be the condition of the Church militant now. For I would remind you of the obvious distinction between the *visible* Church on the one hand, and the *real, invisible* Church on the other. The former is the external organization, in whole or in part; while the latter includes only all *real Christians* who may be found either inside or outside of any or all external organizations, sympathizing with Christ, and doing the work committed to their hands. In regard to the visible Church, history teaches us, on many a page, that although it holds a warrant of existence, and a commission to do work from Jesus Christ himself, it may, and often has, become demoralized. The light may become darkness. The salt may lose its savor. And if the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness! and if the salt lose its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?

The general position I take, then, is that the visible Church is, and always has been, the standard of morality for the world, and that whenever her doctrines become erroneous, and the practices of her people become loose and immoral, she ceases to exert [illegible] upon the world, and the world, refusing any other standard, goes to destruction. In other words, that she is, by the appointment of her great head, "the Light of the World," to illumine the minds of men, and to solve the question—What am I to believe concerning God?—and that she is "the salt of the earth," to exercise her antiseptic and prophylactic influence upon the morals of society so as to solve, by the reflection of her people's example, the other great question—"What duty does God require of man?" Christianity is not a myth. Its doctrines are not a set of metaphysical abstractions, like the dogmas of the schoolmen. It is a revelation of great practical truths, which the world is perishing for. The Son of God having been manifested to destroy the works of the devil, and his followers professing to believe in his divine mission, it must be evident from the words of Christ and Paul already quoted, that to make a successful war upon evil, we must oppose it *because it is evil*. The Church must not *capitulate* and compromise with the devil, her great enemy. War, incessant war, war to the knife and the knife to the hilt, is her clear policy as well as her duty. The moment she listens to the pleading of the enemy and spares *one* known sin, she loses her power of rebuke, because she loses her *consistency*. The same reason that induces her to spare one form of evil will warrant her in sparing others. She is then demoralized. The poison of treason has destroyed her life's blood. She must ground her arms. Schwartz, the missionary, in organizing Christian Churches among the heathen, from the purest motives in the world, most foolishly bargained with the devil to allow *caste*, which was clearly an anti-Christian institution. But as soon as the missionary put the key of the fortress into the enemy's hand, the enemy marched in and ultimately drove out the missionary. So that all Schwartz's work had to be done over again. One of the English Bishops in the East, profiting by this fact, has waged an uncompromising and successful warfare against this same vice, to the joy and approval of all his countrymen.

When a young man is about to leave home to engage in the responsibilities of business, does his father inculcate upon him the duty of integrity and faithfulness to his employers, because it is not *policy*, refined and in good taste to *steal?* No. He inculcates this lesson upon him because to lay his hands on other people's property is *wrong, inherently* and *essentially*, and can never be made *right*. No matter who commits it, the rich or the poor, the professor or non-professor of religion, angel, man or devil, it is wrong as an act. This is what I mean by a *principle*—the beginning, the fountain that makes and qualifies the stream of life. Degrees consist in *crimes*, not persons. Dr. Dodd was hung for forgery in England as if he had been a town pauper. A man cannot, with a good conscience and a brave and hopeful heart, make battle against one evil while he knows himself to be guilty of another equally great. This explains the reason why certain reformers of our day have grown tired of the conflict and thrown away their weapons. They were not reformers *upon principle*. They were governed by mere impulse or taste. They did not say with Luther when surrounded by the blood-hounds of the papacy, "I *must* go to the city of Worms."

I have already alluded to the fact that, in this, the freest country on earth, where Christianity has everything it ever asked for, and where the Church is free and untrammelled by the exactions of government, *vice*, in all its forms of meanness and impudence, and *crime*, in all its boldness, stalks abroad through the land, hidding defiance to both Heaven and earth. There is a cause for this: and in assigning it, I take the *particular position* that the American Church, by its spirit of compromise, has lowered the standard of American morals, and, by the same act, has raised the floodgates of evil. In proof of my position, I ask your attention to the present posture of the American Tract Society of New York, an institution that embraces among its officers and patrons men from all the evangelical Churches of the land. In the proceedings of the Presbyterian Synod of New York and New Jersey a few years ago, we have a Report of a Committee appointed at a preceding meeting in reference to the liberties taken by the Tract Society in the matter of altering books. This committee directed their attention to some twenty volumes of the more important publications issued, and found, 1. Changes which affect the *style* of the author. 2. Changes which affect the *meaning* and *design* of the author. These alterations, in many cases, concern the facts of history—historical statements often being suppressed and others of a different tenor put in their place. 3. The changes made in the works of Jonathan Edwards, a dead, and D'Aubigne, a living author, affect the *main designs of the authors themselves*. 4. These changes affect also the doctrines found in these books. By this system of expurgation, Edward and John Flavel are made to father sentiments which they never held, and which they repudiated, living and dying. These changes are the more astounding from the fact that no adequate notice is given of them, either in the books themselves or in the Annual Reports of the Society. In a work of the celebrated Henry, the very *foundation principle* of the book is suppressed, yet there is no intimation whatever of any alteration. In another work, there are five hundred alterations, of which no notice is given either in footnote or in preface. But books, thus mutilated, expurgated and interpolated are sent out to the world under the sanction of this religious Society as containing the veritable sentiments of their deceased authors, over their own names. Now, look at the gross immorality of these undeniable acts, and the natural effect they must have in destroying the public reverence for truth and right. What is *forgery*, a crime that commercial nations have generally punished with death? Writing the name of a person, without his knowledge or consent, on a paper containing an obligation to pay money. Huntington, the broker of New York, did this, and was sent to the penitentiary for it. Young Lane, more recently, did the same thing, and is now in the same prison. What is *counterfeiting?* Altering or forging bank bills, or uttering and circulating base coin as good, representing a man, or set of men, or government, as saying or doing what they do not say or do in regard to money. Which is the more valuable, *sacred, eternal truth and fact*, or paltry *money?* You answer truth, for while the fires of the last day shall consume the earth and all its works, *Truth* shall remain un[illegible] the eternal years [illegible] man's name to doctrines which he did not believe, to make him state facts which he knew to be no facts, but false assertions, can it be wrong, in such a small matter as money, to change a ten-dollar note into a hundred-dollar note? And if evangelical Christians can take such liberties with the *facts of history*, and with dead men's names, was it wrong in Schuyler, under a press of circumstances, to forge certificates of stock in the New Haven Railroad? Because evangelical men do such deeds, and then *pray over it*, does that make it right in the sight of God or man? Mr. Thomas Allibone was wonderfully given to prayer and the distribution of tracts, but did that sanction and sanctify his plundering the Bank of Pennsylvania and reducing multitudes of widows and orphans to beggary? Thou that sayest a man should not counterfeit a ten dollar-note, nor circulate spurious coin in the commerce of the world, dost thou interpolate the writings of the defenceless dead, and forge their names to sentiments which they never held? Who is so blind as not to see that in the same proportion in which immortal truth and fact are more valuable than money, the conduct of the Tract Society is more culpable and dangerous to the community than the comparative peccadilloes of Lane, Huntington and Monroe Edwards? I am willing to admit that the *motive* of the Tract Society was good. But does *that* justify an act clearly and unquestionably *wrong?* Then, let us forever give up blaming the Church of Rome for her doctrine of "pious frauds." Then, let us dull the edge of our reproof of those mendacious missionaries who, to get the savages of the forest to join the church, told them that Jesus Christ was a hunter too, and carried a tomahawk and scalping-knife in his belt, and had a whole string of scalps hung up in his wigwam, which he had taken from the heads of his foes! It was long ago settled as a principle in Christian ethics that we had no right to do evil that real good, or imaginary good, might come of it. Suppose one of the Tract managers should visit the penitentiary at Sing Sing and call upon the Wall street forger, who boasts of his descent from the Puritans, and say to him, "Brother Huntington, I have come to pull out of thine eye the mote of forging and counterfeiting money." Avaunt and quit my sight, he would indignantly say; thou hypocrite, cast out the *beam* out of thine own eye. Then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the *mote* out of thy brother's eye. You set me the example of forging and counterfeiting on a large scale, by sending out spurious, interpolated editions of dead men's works, for which they could not prosecute you in a court of justice. You used the printing-press and the steam-engine in perpetrating and perpetuating the injury done your victims. If you have done right, I have not done wrong.

While examining this subject of *fraud*, gilded over by prayer and evangelical speech, I must call your attention to the effect produced upon the mercantile and business virtues of the nation by the system of American slavery. The Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, a native-born Kentuckian, and a resident in a slave State nearly all his life, thus speaks: "What is slavery as it exists among us? We reply, it is that condition enforced by the laws of one-half the States of this confederacy, in which one portion of the community, called masters, is allowed such power over another portion, called slaves, as, 1, to deprive them of the entire earnings of their own labor, thus COMMITTING CLEAR ROBBERY." Some distinguished Doctors of Divinity in New York and Boston, although they wear glasses of a highly magnifying power, cannot see that pocket-picking, highway-robbery and slaveholding are sisters of the same family. Hear Dr. Breckinridge on this point: "Out upon such folly! The man who cannot see that involuntary, domestic slavery, as it exists among us, is founded upon the principle of taking by force that which is another's, has simply no moral sense"—that is, he has no *conscience*—that is, he is not *human*—that is, he is a brute.

Labor is the creation of wealth, and the laborer is God-like in this, that he, by his toil or his ingenuity, brings into existence something that was not in existence before. He has, therefore, by the law of nature, the law of nations, and the law of God, the clearest, most indefeasible and exclusive right to the avails of his own labor. Under the Mosaic code, and by the law of Christianity, terrible curses are pronounced upon those who rob the laborer of his hire. Here, then, under the very eyes of the nation, and upheld by the practice and teachings of the *Church*, is a grand, colossal system of *plunder* and *fraud!* Four millions of the American people, represented in the halls of Congress, are its victims! The robbers who infest the seas and plunder ships upon the ocean, conscious that their vocation is well named "piracy," slink away from the scene of their exploits into the shallow water along shore. But here stands out in the broad light of day, not one case of robbery, but a *system* of robbery—not robbery by the force of *temptation*, but robbery upon *principle*, defrauding men by the million! This is not the worst. This legalized system not only steals, upon principle, all the hard earnings of its victims and puts them into the pocket of the *thief*, as Dr. Breckinridge would call him, but it chattelizes the human being himself. It drags him down from the place assigned him by his God on the scale of being, and ranks him, to use the legal phrase, not among sentient beings, but among *things*. In this consists the atrocity of the crime of slaveholding. Common thieves and pirates are decent enough to blush at the idea of legalizing and sanctifying their business. But slavery robs upon *principle* in broad daylight. It robs *religiously* and prays and sings hymns over it. I have great sympathy for a robber if he commits the offence because he is needy and acknowledges that it was wrong. But when he says that he has a *right* to rob, that he robs upon *principle*, and believes that the abstract principle of stealing is not malum in se, then he is to be feared above all other robbers. So, in like manner, if the slaveholder justifies himself in the abstract and upon principle, he becomes a common enemy of mankind. There is no principle in the way of his kidnapping your children or mine. It is for this reason that the Apostle Paul ranks this criminal with murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers. But let us see the application of the argument. We have been plundering from the slaves for whole generations: is it strange that the slaves should in their turn plunder from us, and that we should begin to steal from each other? If it be right in a South Carolina planter to take away from a hundred laborers all the wealth they have created by their toil and sweat, please to tell me where was the wrong in Mr. Frederick Porter to take away $60,000 out of the treasury of the Sunday School Union? And if you palliate, excuse, legalize and justify the whole system of slavery, which Dr. Breckinridge declares to be a system of *clear robbery*, with what force can you reprove the bank thieves, the railroad thieves, the Galphinizers, and the numberless small operators who figure in your police courts? Is it consistent and courageous in us ministers of the Gospel to hurl our anathemas from the pulpit against the poor starving rogues in rags, while we ransack the Bible for arguments to justify the rogues in ruffles? Is it not clear as the noon-day sun that if the Church sanctions a system of crime by bringing the criminals to the communion-table, she has rendered herself powerless in reforming away lesser vices? Thou that sayest a man shall not steal bank funds, railroad stock and money out of letters in the post-office, dost thou steal all the hard earnings of the laborer from one year's end to the other? Now, if you wish to put down the frauds, robberies, peculations and speculations which have spread like an epidemic over the land, you must begin at the house of God with your judgment. You have no right to ask a world lying in sin, which makes no profession of allegiance to God, to raise a *higher standard* of morality than we have in the Church. All sin belongs to the same family. There is an eternal hostility between what is wrong

(CONTINUED ON THE FOURTH PAGE.)

ANNIVERSARY PROCEEDINGS.

[CONTINUED FROM FOURTH PAGE.]

thought which here demand attention, which are here to be read and applied.

I affirm, then, that the execution of John Brown was a gross and bloody murder. It was not he who deserved to be hung on the gallows; it was they who deserved it, for they were traitors and murderers who fastened upon him the hand of violence, and hurried him to what we call a premature grave. Now, then, I pray you, what must we think, however charitable we may be, however disposed to be indulgent by a regard for the temptations to which they were exposed, however much we may be disposed to look with a kind eye, with a loving heart, on the men I have ventured this evening to criticise—what shall we think of him as a statesman, what reliance, I pray you, can we place, in this glorious and stormy time, as Wendell Phillips is so fond of calling it—what reliance can we place upon him in the emergency in which we are expected to proceed, amid prospects so dark as we see before us?

Yet we are assured that our prospects are bright! To be sure, it is said, now and then, something may occur which may awaken our fears and excite our apprehension, and we may tremble for the Republic; but whenever we are able to look with a comprehensive eye, and calmly and soberly to reflect, we see clearly that the foundations of the Republic are laid in the eternal rock; that our prospects are not only cheering, but glorious; that there is no reason to apprehend danger, no ground on which we may expect punishment. Well, then, God must have retired from his throne, justice must have been stabbed to the heart, our humanity—dear as it is to the universal Father—must have been given up as a hopeless possession! Clearly, then, we cannot place any confidence in the ordinances of nature, in the decrees of high Heaven, in the great lessons of wisdom which are inculcated in the Sacred Volume.

My friends and fellow-citizens, you must dispose of [illegible] plain, straightforward statements, so far as you heeded them at all, each man according to his [illegible]; and in the light of them, if any light they [illegible] around, you must dispose of your responsibility [illegible] relations to the ballot-box (applause).

J. R. W. SLOANE, of the Covenanter Church in [illegible]ork, made the closing speech. It was of the deepest feeling and power, and fitly closed the day's meeting, when three able and eloquent orthodox ministers had appeared and spoken on the platform of the American Anti-Slavery Society, cordially welcomed by the anti-slavery host, although become of little reputation, among their own fellow-orthodox theologians.

Speech of Rev. J. R. W. Sloane.

I remember the case of an ambitious student, who took, as the caption of his maiden effort, "The Past, the Present, and the Future." I feel here to-night, Mr. Chairman, at this late hour, in view of this great question, like that young man, with that large theme before him for a fifteen minutes' speech. I presume no one will deny that the question of American Slavery is the most important question that is presented to this age and to this nation—shall I not say, that has been presented to any age and any nation, at least since the great Reformation of the seventeenth century? I remember, when I was in the neighborhood of the White Mountains last summer, that wherever I turned my eye, Mount Washington stood conspicuous above his fellows, that it was the one great object which always arrested my gaze, and to which my fellow-travellers always directed my attention. So is it with regard to this great question of American slavery. It is well-nigh ubiquitous; it is almost omnipresent. It meets you everywhere. If you open your morning newspaper, the first word that strikes your eye is "slavery." If you enter the halls of Congress, you need not ask upon what subject that excited speaker is haranguing, for, whether he hails from the pine forests of Maine or from the "continuous woods, where rolls the Oregon," whether he comes from the prairies of Northern Wisconsin and Minnesota, or from the everglades of Florida or the rice swamps of Georgia and the Carolinas, one subject only claims his attention—that subject, Slavery. In the ecclesiastical convocations, whether it be the Episcopal Convention, the Methodist Conference, the Presbyterian Assembly, or the Congregational Council, nine chances to one that the word which first meets your ear is "slavery." In fine, I know of but one spot in all this broad and fair land where you are perfectly exempt from the intrusion of this very disagreeable subject (to some). Of course, I mean a fashionable church, in one of our great Eastern cities (laughter and applause).

The period in which we have assembled is a very remarkable one. Society is stirred to its profoundest depths. The country is rocked, and has been for months, as by a moral earthquake. The bands that bind political parties are snapped like the withes on the arms of Samson; and that political Judas, which for thirty years past, has ever been able to betray the cause of liberty, after purchasing, by the Dred Scott decision and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the vast, grand field of all our territory for the introduction of slavery, has fallen headlong, burst in the midst, committed political suicide, at the bare sight of its own atrocities, and all its bowels have gushed out (loud applause). Why is it, my friends, that we witness such a state of things as the present? Have we all been seized with frenzy and madness? Are we, like men bewitched by the glamour and weird fascination of Niagara until they plunge into the abyss, about to plunge into national ruin? No, I answer; a thousand times, no. The reason of all this is that we are face to face with the mightiest question of the age; that we are face to face with a question that cannot be ignored and will not be put off; a question that must be settled; a question in which the interests of thousands and millions are involved; a question on which the most important issues for our race are involved.

I have here my charges to bring against slavery, like my brother (Rev. Mr. Bradford) who has gone before me; had I not, I should not be here. My first charge against it is that it murders liberty in the persons of four millions of men, of the same blood, made in the image of the same God, endowed with the same inalienable right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and bought with the blood of the same Redeemer with ourselves (applause). That, my friends, extends not only to these four millions, but to their children, not for one, two, three or a thousand generations, but to all generations. The tremendous doom and curse of slavery rests upon them like an eternal punishment, that knows neither respite nor termination. Not only does it extend to the number in this country, and to their children, but in that broad land which has recently been opened by Livingstone and other explorers there is the source, in its teeming millions, for an inexhaustible supply, which, through the channel of the slave trade, is to be poured into this lower deep of American chattel slavery. In these grand discoveries, in which science sees vast empires added to her already magnificent domain, in those teeming millions, on which Christianity looks with hopeful eyes, as fields white to the harvest of missionary and beneficent effort, Slavery sees only the elements of her own increase, and the advance of her own power, places her basilisk eye on those teeming millions, and, like the daughters of the horse-leech, cries, "Give, give!"—like another grave, is never satisfied—like another hell, enlarges herself and opens wide her mouth, that she may receive them and their children to the irreversible doom of oppression and bondage forever! (Applause.) We have here to settle this great question; and not only so, but in this land, and on this battle-field, the great question of slavery is to be settled forever. I have no doubt that if we can cut off the head of the hydra here, we have ended the conflict for all time, for all the ages that are yet to come. As I believe in a more glorious era than has ever yet dawned on the world, and as I believe in a grander order of the ages than has ever yet arisen, so I believe that this question of slavery for white and black is to be settled here forever.

I have another charge to bring against it, which is that it is opposed to our modern Christian civilization. "Two elements," says Guizot, "are comprised in the great fact that we call civilization—it lives on two conditions, it manifests itself in two methods—the progress of the individual and the progress of society; the enlargement of the faculties of man and the amelioration of the social system." But is there any one so ignorant as not to know that there is no amelioration of the social system possible to slavery? that kindness to the slave is altogether out of the question? And as to any progress, intellectual or moral, of the individual, let the slave laws, forbidding any one to teach them to read or write, answer for that. I charge upon slavery not merely that it is a relic of barbarism, but that it is an element of barbarism. Wherever it exists, there society must partake of barbarism, more or less. This fact is illustrated in all the history of the past, but more especially is it illustrated in our land and in our day. Do you ask for the proofs? I point you to the recent executions on Virginia soil. I point you to that man who stood on this platform to-day (Rev. Mr. Worth), freed from a Southern prison-house on condition that he pays to North Carolina three thousand dollars. I wonder what the Old North State is going to do with so much money! If it had been South Carolina, I should think that she had got the money to buy the crutches to walk out of the Union with, that Wendell Phillips has told us of (laughter).

I charge slavery with being the foe to modern civilization, and the proof comes from the halls of Congress during the present winter. There may be exceptions to the rule, but the nature of slavery, its tendency, is to create a set of cowardly, brutal ruffians who are unfit for the intercourse and society of civilized and refined gentlemen (loud cheers). The billingsgate and drunkenness, the vituperation and bullying, on one side and the other, in the hall of Representatives, are the proofs, the Smiths, the Barksdales and the Pryors are the personal illustrations, of what I say. And yet, we are told, these are "God's ministers for good"; these are the men, according to our lower-law divines, to whom we owe respect and obedience "for conscience sake"! These are the men who are "a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well"! These are the men who "bear not the sword (nor the Bowie-knife) in vain"! (Laughter and cheers.) These are the men who reach out the arm of their tyranny and take from his fireside and his home one of our esteemed citizens, and may do the same with you and with me, if they choose, to-night.

But, again, I charge it with being the foe to the morals of our country and our nation. Will any man flaunt it in my face here that I do not know what I am talking about? I have stood upon the soil cursed by its presence; I have seen something of its yet unwritten atrocities, something of its yet inconceivable wickedness. I have no language to describe the moral atrocities of which it is always the parent. I have talked with master and slave, and I say that the half has not been told, never can be told, never will be told, of the corrupt state of society all over the South. Take one fact, which has been already alluded to to-night—that there are four million of human beings who have no law of marriage, who are living in a state of promiscuous concubinage, under the power of irresponsible masters, many of whom are the vilest of the vile that walk the face of the earth. Remember that this degradation has been going on for centuries, and then you can form some idea of what the state of things must be there. I might illustrate by anecdote after anecdote, drawn from my own personal observation, but let one suffice. I said to an old slave, whom I met on one occasion, who was living alone, "Is it possible that you have lived to this period of life and never been married?" I wish you could have seen the smile that spread over his countenance at my exceeding greenness as he replied—"Lor bress you, massa, I have had more wives than you could put in this yere room." And then the old man went on and told me the story of the fate of his wives, one after another sold and separated from him. A Presbyterian minister (Old School) permitted his own son, fourteen years old, to marry a slave girl that belonged to him, on a Saturday evening, and in less than three months sold her to an Old School leader, who lived fourteen miles distant, and then had the effrontery to send a letter by me dunning his brother church-member for his money! Of course I did not know what the contents of the letter were; if I had, I should not have taken it. He said it was a little matter of business! This is a feeble illustration of what is passing all the time inside the Churches of the South.

But, then, I make this charge not merely against the South, but against the whole nation. I do not expect much of nations now, or for ages to come, perhaps, in point of morality. No nation has ever existed, as yet, that has taken this book (the Bible) as the basis of its statute-law, and incorporated the principles of Christianity into its constitution of government. No nation exists to-day that has the slightest claim to be called Christian. Nations there are in which there are Christian men, but a Christian nation has never existed, and does not exist. But there are, I think, violations of the moral law by our public men such as the world does not witness elsewhere. Tell me in what Christian or what heathen land will the highest court of justice decide that one class have no rights which another class are bound to respect? Tell me in what Christian or heathen land a man may be a prominent candidate for the highest office in the gift of the public who openly avows but one sentiment (if we may judge by the frequency of its repetition), that this government was made for white men, and not for "niggers"—to use his own elegant phraseology. You know that Wm. H. Seward says no man can ever be President of the United States who spells "negro" with two g's; and I think that Stephen Arnold Douglas is yet to illustrate the truth of the assertion (laughter and cheers). Why, in the days of the Spanish Inquisition no such atrocious sentiments were uttered. Never, in the Cortez of Spain, in the days of the Star Chamber, in the worst reign of the brutal Henry or the bloody Mary, in the Privy Council, in the days of the perjured Charles and the atrocious James, were such sentiments uttered as our halls of legislation have echoed to during the present and the preceding sessions. Do you ask me for proof? What crime that ever dishonored God or disgraced human nature, to which statesmen have given their consent, ever equalled in atrocity that of the slave trade? And yet, has not that trade found its unblushing advocates in our halls of legislation? We wonder that such villany can exist in the light of day. What is our astonishment to find it has its seat in the Senate-chamber and on the very throne of justice itself!

But I have another and still more severe charge to bring against it. It is the dishonor it has done to our common Christianity and our holy religion. Not content with disgracing our statute-book, not content with robbing men of every right that man holds dear, it has thrust its foul and hideous presence into the sanctuary of God; it has entwined its slimy folds around the sacred altar, and with its thousand hissing tongues of asps profanes the very garden of the ark of the covenant of our God; and the man who would assail it is branded as an "Infidel." I believe in a Bible that is inspired from beginning to end, but it is a Bible all flaming with tongues of fire against an atrocity so iniquitous as this; it is a Bible in which there is no sanction for this crime, from first to last; a Bible which, if you were to take its principles and make them the fundamental law of the land, slavery would perish before to-morrow's sun sank in the West. I believe in a personal Savior; but it is a Savior who cast in his lot with the poor, the weak, and the degraded. It is a Savior who is to be seated on the throne of final judgment, and, if men come and say, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? have we not built up great Tract Societies and large churches, and established great missionary efforts? have we not edited *Presbyterians* and *Observers*, and in thy name done many wonderful works? will answer, "Inasmuch as ye have not done it unto these my brethren, ye have not done it unto me; I never knew ye." I believe, certainly, in the Church of the living God, but it is an organization not established for injustice, not to be a great weapon in the hand of Slavery, but to be a great instrumentality of beneficence and of good to our race; and I charge it upon Slavery that, by a hideous metamorphosis, such as never entered into the imagination of a heathen poet, it has transformed the Church of the living God into an engine of iniquity and wrong, and unfurled the black banner of Death on those battlements from which alone should float the glorious banner of the Cross; that it has brought more disgrace on this book, and on our holy religion, than all the infidels of the last four centuries.

Now, my friends, I have no time to enter upon a point which is extremely interesting to me, but here let me say that I was present, not many days ago, in a so-called religious assembly in this city, which declared, by a vote of 91 to 89, that they would not condemn mercenary slaveholding, and I heard, from the lips of a man professing to be a Gospel minister, language that might have been appropriate for a slave factory, that might have become the deck of a slave-ship, that might have answered at the head of a coffle of slaves, marched off, to the tune of "Hail, Columbia," from Virginia to Georgia, but which was a disgrace and an outrage to the common sentiments of a Christian community, much more to a body calling itself an evangelical organization. The substance of his statement was, that he had bought and sold slaves, and would do so again, under the same circumstances! And this man, with his hands dripping with the blood of his fellow-men, undertakes to preach the Gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ! It was said of a pastor of this city, who volunteered a defence of the system itself, and scorned the man who would say a word for the noble martyr, John Brown, that his pockets were lined with forty thousand dollars, the price of the men, women, and children whom he had sold into interminable bondage. Are we to be silent and dumb when these things are so? Are we to bear to have our religion insulted and outraged, and lift no voice against it? I answer, No! a thousand times, No!

Now, it is too often taken for granted, I think, by our friends on this platform (judging by their wide-sweeping denunciation) that this organization of which I have been speaking is the true Church. What is the Christian Church? I trace it by the blood of the martyrs in the ages of the past; I mark her place by the lurid flames that have burned her professors. Where was the Church in those early days but in the fastnesses of the Alps and among the mountains of Scotland? And is there not a large remnant left to-day who will have nothing to do with this atrocious system, and would banish it from the Church of God? I speak thus far for the Presbyterians, and I say there are more than seven hundred ministers who believe the oppression of this land merits the wrath and curse of God, both in this life and the life to come, and have so recorded it, and will not admit a slaveholder to their communion (applause). And why have not we, the seven hundred, as much right to call ourselves the Presbyterian Church, in the view of that great pro-slavery organization, as they have, and a far better right?

I mention these things, my friends, only that justice may be done on all sides. I screen no man or set of men from the just rebukes that belong to them when they attempt to cover up any such iniquity as this. But I know the wide-spread influence of this. I know that when the editors of religious newspapers come to speak of the friends of the slave, they dip their pens in the poison of asps; when they speak of slavery and pro-slavery men their pens drop honey, and they are held up as the very chief of God's saints, the salt of the earth, to be loved and admired. Such an outspoken and free paper as *The Independent*—and it is in many respects *independent*, and the best of its class—wriggles and sticks on the term *malum in se*—slavery is sin in itself; joins in the common cry against Dr. Cheever, and stigmatizes the President of this Society as an infidel, lest its subscription list should fall off! And what shall I say of a man like the pastor of Plymouth Church, a mighty son of Ephraim, who turned back, fainthearted, on the day of battle, until dragged forward by a member of his own Church, a boy in age, but not in mind (applause)—until the editorial lash of *The Tribune* has been laid upon his back, being a mere quietest, and not taking that prominent position which might be expected of him?

Now, shall I not charge it upon such a system as this that it has dishonored the cause which I most honor? By that Bible which I revere, and in the name of that Savior whose follower I profess to be, and of that salvation in which I profess to trust, I shall protest everywhere and at all times against a slander and an opprobrium so foul brought upon the cause of His holy religion.

I am sometimes asked, what good does all your talking do? Well, sir, it is my trade to talk, and perhaps I think more of it than others do; but I believe that talking has destroyed every great form of evil that has ever existed. I have to say that I believe in the sword too; and if one day of the oppression of the slaves is worse than a thousand years of that which our fathers threw off by the Revolution, they have the right, had they the power, to throw off the oppression and bondage that are upon them. And so it will be, if the nation does not heed our talk. I prefer reason, remonstrance, moral suasion to the very last, if possible. I would avert a doom like that from my country and my friends at the South, by talking; I would avert a doom like that by bringing moral suasion to bear, in order to hold back the arm of an avenging God, and restrain those bolts of justice which must, sooner or later, descend, unless this nation repents of its iniquity. Abolitionists have talked, and it is very likely they will continue to talk, while they have *The New York Herald* to send their speeches all over the South. I will appeal to every argument within the whole range and compass of human thought, in order to put an end, at once and forevermore, to this enormous and gigantic system of iniquity.

The Convention then adjourned, to meet on Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY MORNING.

The Society reässembled at the Cooper Institute at 10 o'clock, the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

The Committee, appointed to nominate officers of the Society for the ensuing year, reported as follows:

PRESIDENT.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, MASSACHUSETTS.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

Peter Libbey,	Maine.	Edward M. Davis,	Pennsylvania.
Luther Melendy,	New Hampshire.	Thomas Whitson,	"
John M. Hawks,	"	Joseph Moore,	"
Jehiel C. Claflin,	Vermont.	Rowland Johnson,	New Jersey.
Francis Jackson,	Massachusetts.	Alfred Gibbs Campbell,	"
Edmund Quincy,	"	Thomas Garrett,	Delaware.
Asa Fairbanks,	Rhode Island.	Thomas Donaldson,	Ohio.
James B. Whitcomb,	Connecticut.	Benjamin Bown,	"
Samuel J. May,	New York.	William Hearn,	Indiana.
Cornelius Bramhall,	"	William Hopkins,	"
Amy Post,	"	Joseph Merritt,	Michigan.
Pliny Sexton,	"	Thomas Chandler,	"
Lydia Mott,	"	Cyrus Fuller,	"
Henry A. Hartt,	"	Carver Tomlinson,	Illinois.
Lucretia Mott,	Pennsylvania.	Caleb Green,	Minnesota.
Robert Purvis,	"	Georgiana B. Kirby,	California.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH, PLAINFIELD, CT.

RECORDING SECRETARY.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, BOSTON.

TREASURER.

FRANCIS JACKSON, BOSTON.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

William Lloyd Garrison,	Sydney Howa
Francis Jackson,	Samuel May,
Edmund Quincy,	William I. B
Maria Weston Chapman,	Charles K. V
Wendell Phillips,	Henry C. Wi
Anne Warren Weston.	Charles Fol

The Report was adopted, and the officers named elected unanimously.

Speech of Giles B. Stebbins.

Mr. GILES B. STEBBINS, of Ann Arbor, Michigan, was the first speaker of the morning. He said:

FRIENDS: I feel that it is a privilege to be here. This Anti-Slavery cause is to me one of the great educating powers of the country. It is not to the pulpits of this country that men look for their moral, religious and spiritual education, in the highest sense of the term, but it is to the great reform movements like this. The Anti-Slavery movement goes back of all creeds and beneath all external authorities—it goes down and takes hold of principle. The question is, do you move in unity with this great idea of universal freedom? It takes hold of those teachings, those laws of God written on the heart of man, and written all over this great universe—those teachings that are older than all books, that are earlier than all creeds, that were old at the first dawn of creation's morning, and shall stand as long as time and humanity endure; and if we are at one with this great principle of human freedom, if we pay allegiance to this law which God has written, not on tables of stone alone, but on the fleshly tablets of the human heart, we are then in unity with this Anti-Slavery movement, and, in unity with that, we are helping to educate the people above the narrow standard of creeds and parchments, up to the great standard of allegiance to principle, unity with ideas, living in the inspirations of the glorious present.

I recollect that, last evening, my friend Mr. Sloane said that the true Church could be traced through all past times by the blood of the martyrs, and the wasting career of fire and fagots. It is true. But I remember, at the same time, that as the red flames streamed up round the shrieking forms of the victims of bigotry in the past, the priests of the popular religion of those days howled "Infidel" round the funeral pile. That is the treatment that the true Church has always received; and I remember that, to-day, the editors of *The Independent*, fresh from their ecclesiastical hobnobbing with South-side Adams, repeat the same charge against Mr. Garrison. But how little is this miserable cry of "infidelity" worth!

This anti-slavery movement is powerfully educating the people, developing their human sentiment, melting away the old partition walls, teaching them the sublime truth of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. When I he[illegible] bably do not bel[illegible] rently thankful t[illegible] lime truths that I [illegible] to feel that he wa[illegible] in allegiance to t[illegible] ceptions, my own [illegible] reverence for th[illegible] regard for those [illegible] manhood and womanhood that lie enfolded in the breast of every human being—these are very precious to me, and, in my comprehension, they give me better tools than any orthodox theologian can have with which to combat slavery. I must use my tools, and, if he thinks his tools are better than mine, he must use them; I cannot complain of that. He must strike with the weapons that he best knows how to use; and certainly I think that if the majestic shade of John Calvin could have come up before him, he would have taken him by the hand, and said, "Well done, good and faithful follower"; and I am just as sure that if that same majestic spirit could come in visible form among the Calvinists of the American Board and the American Tract Society, and other Calvinistic evangelical organizations of the nineteenth century, he would utter words that would awe, with their weighty majesty, and would say, "You pretend, poor, miserable creatures! you pretend to be the exponents of God's immutable and eternal justice; you pretend to believe that God is sufficient for all things; and that you are to be his servants, to carry out to accomplishment his great designs." He would have rebuked those who claim to be his followers, and would have approved these other professed followers of his, because they are true to that sublime conception of universal justice which dawned brightly and gloriously in the mind of John Calvin.

This anti-slavery movement is educating our country to a higher moral courage; it is teaching us truth to ourselves, fidelity to our own natures. That is fidelity in the highest sense of the term; and when you find men and women untrue to themselves, and therefore inevitably, sooner or later, untrue to humanity, there is the dangerous form of infidelity. Shakspeare has it grandly, when he puts into the mouth of Polonius the words, "To thine own self be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou can'st not then be false to any man"—least of all, false to the slave.

Now, this moral cowardice with which our country so much abounds, which makes men cringe, and fawn, and tremble before this overshadowing Slave Power; oh, how pitiable and servile it is! I remember, one day last winter, about the time of the execution of John Brown, riding in the cars in Michigan, and two clergymen whom I knew sat near me and discussed the merits and demerits of John Brown, and they were just as hearty in commendation of the spirit of John Brown as they possibly could be. I waited anxiously, day after day, and month after month, but I heard not one word from any pulpit in that vicinity, save one, in recognition of the heroic qualities of that brave man. Nay, more than that, when a large public meeting was held in our town, in reference to that event, all classes were present except the clerical profession. Not a single minister dared to sanction the meeting by his presence. All the Republican lawyers could come, even Democratic lawyers could come, but not a minister among them all could come. Yet they can repeat and re-repeat the charge of infidelity. How little is this miserable cry worth, in the majestic and beautiful presence of this great cause of universal freedom! How weak and puny it is to think of measuring men and women by the creeds or books they believe in or do not believe in! How much more grand and sublime is the great test. Do you accept this great universal law that God has written on the hearts of all men? Do you recognize the brotherhood of man, without any distinction of lineage, or race, or complexion? It is fidelity to humanity, to your own convictions, faithfulness to your own soul, that is required of each one of you. No, friends; turning away from all these miserable sectarian tests, if we have any test, let us rather embody it in the words of one of England's greatest poets, Leigh Hunt:

> 'Abou Ben Adhem (may his tribe increase!)
> Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace,
> And saw, within the twilight of his room,
> Making it rich, and like a lily in bloom,
> An angel writing in a book of gold.
> Exceeding peace had made Ben Adhem bold,
> And to the presence in the room he said,
> 'What writest thou?' The angel raised his head,
> And, with a voice made of all sweet accord,
> Answered, 'The names of those that love the Lord.'
> 'And is mine one?' said Abou. 'Nay, not so,'
> Replied the angel. Abou spake more low,
> But cheerily still: 'I pray thee, then,
> Write me as one that loves his fellow-men.'
> The angel wrote and vanished; the next night
> He came again, with a great wakening light,
> And showed the names whom love of God had blest,
> And lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest!"

J. ELIZABETH JONES, of Ohio, was then introduced to the meeting, and delivered an address of the most touching and interesting character. [A full report may be looked for next week.]

Rev. GEORGE F. NOYES, of New York city, addressed the meeting, attributing to the President of this Society the honorable responsibility for the whole anti-slavery agitation now existing, and expressing his views of the true philosophy of the cause. [Report next week.]

Rev. SAMUEL MAY, JR., then made an earnest appeal to the members of the Society and the friends of the cause generally, to contribute liberally, in view of the great work to be accomplished, and the special exigencies of the times. He was followed by Mr. GARRISON, who briefly addressed the audience on the same topic, contrasting the munificent sum received annually by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (upwards of 400,000) with the small amount contributed to the American Anti-Slavery Society, which, he said, was the only Missionary, Bible or Education Society in the land, in an honest sense. He hoped the friends would remember that this was a [illegible] for themselves—that they might have a country. It was not only that those in bonds might be set free, but that throughout the world every throne might totter to its fall, and every form of despotism come to an end.

Mr. GARRISON spoke on the real character and meaning of the United States Constitution, in reply to the views expressed by some previous speakers. [Report next week.]

Rev. Mr. BALME, of Wisconsin, said he desired to show by his presence upon the platform that his heart was in this movement; but orthodoxy, with its elevating principles, was the only power which could push it to a successful termination. The Gospel of Jesus Christ would restore humanity to those degraded to a level with the brute. It was to the Christian Church that we looked for the manifestation of that Gospel. He proceeded to draw a contrast between the way in which even the Church treated the sheep-stealer and the man-stealer, and commented with severity upon the Fulton street prayer-meetings, where, instead of praying for all men everywhere, men were thrust out, of whom he was one, for attempting this. They were only allowed to pray for some men somewhere, not for all men everywhere.

Mr. GARRISON read the following letter, which he had just received from Rev. Dr. Furness of Philadelphia:

MY DEAR FRIEND: I have just received your telegraphic message, and, although I have not any one decisive reason for not being with you in person as I am in spirit, yet a number of little reasons unite to prevent my presence at New York. As I have always attended the May [illegible]r my own sake, accounting it an honor and [illegible] I cannot think that you *need* me now when [illegible]athering giants around you, and such eloquent [illegible]e raised in behalf of the sacred Rights of [illegible]. So great and holy is the cause for which [illegible]mble that while it animates, it overpowers me, [illegible]best and strongest word that I can utter seems to me [illegible]t the feeble stammering of a child. It is not the wrongs of millions of Southern slaves only that are at stake. The Anti-Slavery movement reveals the absence of all principle in the patriotism, all faith in the religion of the land. In speaking for the slave, you are pleading for the personal salvation of every soul of us. Whenever I have stood with you on that sacred platform, for that holy cause, the truths and interests involved, both temporal and eternal, have so opened before me, in such vastness and depth, that I have been well-nigh overwhelmed at the view. It seems as if, for the terrible wrong of American oppression, I had nothing to articulate and could only break out into a wild "cry of honest indignation. O it is unutterably sad that these millions of intelligent people, possessed of hearts and consciences, should so quietly consent, as we do, to build our commerce and our luxury upon the crushed souls and bodies of our poor African brother. God send his light into our darkness!

Perhaps I shall run on for a few hours after all! I am much exercised in my mind at this moment, not *feeling free* (as our Quaker friends say) to stay or to go. Cordially yours, however, at all events,

W. H. FURNESS.

Adjourned to 3 o'clock, p. m.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

The Society reässembled at the Cooper Institute, Mr. GARRISON in the chair. WILLIAM WELLS BROWN, once a slave in Missouri, but for many years a freeman, was introduced by the PRESIDENT, and received with welcome applause. He testified strongly to the determination of the colored people to remain in this country, in spite of all efforts to remove them. [Report next week.]

Rev. SAMUEL LONGFELLOW, of Brooklyn, addressed the meeting in earnest commendation of the objects, purpose and courageous spirit of the Anti-Slavery Society, declaring the great need of its continued action, and particularly dwelling upon the inhumanity of the land as shown in all its treatment of the colored people. [Report next week.]

Mr. GARRISON—Ladies and Gentlemen: Among the tracts recently published by the American Anti-Slavery Society is one entitled, "The New Reign of Terror in the Slave States, for the Years 1859–'60." It makes a pamphlet of 144 pages, and is occupied with the recital of the multitudinous atrocities perpetrated within that [illegible] on Northern citizens found in the South- [illegible] suspected, merely because they were [illegible]s, of sympathizing with those in bond- [illegible]nd feathered, their heads shaved [illegible] with the whip, and every atrocity and [illegible]le committed upon them—and this, so [illegible]th is concerned, without any general indignation or alarm, without any thought of possible redress, almost with entire indifference and apathy, as though every man felt himself made simply to be used up by the slaveholder or his minion, if found south of Mason and Dixon's line. Hundreds of cases are here brought together, and hundreds more might be added; and yet men talk to us about our country, our Union, our Constitution, our flag—men who know, if they know anything, if they are not idiotic, that so far as the southern portion of our country is concerned, no man is allowed to stand upon its soil and be a freeman before God. The slaveholder may talk of the whole country for himself; the slaveholder may glory in the Constitution; the slaveholder may talk about the star-spangled banner protecting him every where. So it does. He may come, and does come, to the North, and he marches over our soil as though he were a demigod—the tallest man among us—the man of the freest speech—the man who dares to say just whatever he chooses, and to spit in our faces and insult us in regard to our ideas of freedom, and to scorn our free institutions, and he does so with all possible impunity; nobody thinks of molesting him, let him speak, let him laugh, let him do what he pleases. On the other hand, any man going down from the North to the South, if he dare to whisper but one single word that indicates hatred of slavery, he is in deadly peril. There is no Constitution to protect him; no Union for him; no star-spangled banner to wave over his head. And yet men talk about preserving "the glorious Union"! What infatuation is this!

However, I did not intend to make any remarks at this time, but only to introduce to you one of the victims—Mr. JAMES CRANGALE, of Ireland, who has been a resident of our country some two years, and of whose atrocious treatment in Georgia you may have heard. He is here, and I invite him to the platform to tell his own story.

Mr. CRANGALE, who was received with hearty applause, then proceeded to detail the circumstances connected with the outrage perpetrated upon him in Augusta, Ga., with which the readers of THE STANDARD are already familiar, and which are given in the pamphlet entitled "The New Reign of Terror," to which Mr. Garrison referred. In conclusion, Mr. C. said that he endorsed the doctrines which had been advocated from that platform, and that hereafter he should use every exertion in his power to bring about the emancipation of the slave (applause).

Speech of William Lloyd Garrison.

THE PRESIDENT again came forward, and, resuming the topic on which he was speaking when he introduced Mr. Crangale, said:

This book ("The New Reign of Terror,") ought to be circulated by millions throughout the Free States; a copy, at least, should be in every household, to

> "Stir a fever in the blood of age,
> And make the infant sinew strong as steel."

What would be the feeling of the South provided a hundredth part of the outrages committed upon Northern citizens had been perpetrated upon Southern men at the North! How many slaveholders could we catch and lynch, make them pay for their own imprisonment, shave their heads, lacerate their bodies, tar and feather them, all because they were Southern men, before there would be a lightning flame throughout the entire South, and the whole body of slaveholders would spring up as one man, and declare war to the knife, if security could not be obtained in any other way? But, on our side, there is no strong emotion, no popular indignation, no sense of the value of liberty. We read these outrages in the papers from day to day as mere items of intelligence. It would seem as if every spark of manhood had died out from our souls; and yet some sparks are still left. I am sorry Mr. Crangale was subjected to such outrageous treatment at the South; and yet, looking at it in another light, I am glad. I am glad they caught an Irishman (laughter); and though I wish well to every Irishman in the world, I should not object to their catching some more of them (renewed laughter). "A fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind," you know; and it is well, perhaps, that we should taste of this cup together. There is another case of an Irishman in Carolina, who was suspected of being an Abolitionist, and was stripped and flogged. They tarred and feathered him, and shaved his head, and when they got out of feathers—for they tarred him more than once—they used cotton—tar and cotton. Two or three of these cases happening to Irishmen, it woke up the indignation of the Catholic paper in this city (*The Tablet*), and the editor declared that if it had come to this, that freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and safety of locomotion had ceased in the South, the sooner the Union was dashed in pieces the better (loud applause). Therefore I felt gratified that, at last, the Irish heart had been touched, and the Irish spirit aroused, through personal suffering at the hands of Southern ruffians.

We have had a great deal to contend with, so far as the Irish population of our country are concerned. I have often said that if this were a fair stand-up fight between native-born Americans, we should soon settle the question. But the calamity has been that the millions who have come here from the Old World in quest of homes have been used by the Slave Power of the country to perpetuate the chains of those in bondage. I do not feel indignant in regard to their position, but only deeply compassionate. "They know not what they do." But it is a tremendous political and religious power exerted in one direction, and that is against the Anti-Slavery enterprise. A few years ago, O'Connell, Father Mathew, and seventy thousand other Irishmen, a considerable portion of them priests of the Catholic Church in Ireland, put their names to an Anti-Slavery Address, calling upon Irishmen in this country to be true to the Anti-Slavery enterprise, and to regard the Abolitionists as the only true friends of freedom in America. But it was received with indifference, contempt, nay, even with hostility, by the great body of Irishmen here. I am very glad, therefore, if it must be so, that through their own sufferings they are made to understand and feel what slavery is.

Let me give you an extract from a speech of O'Connell on the subject of American slavery, and I would that every Irishman in our country could read the words of the great Liberator, as a voice from the other world, and give a hearty and cordial assent to them. Mr O'Connell had been admonished by the Irish Repeal Associations in our country that if he opened his lips in opposition to American slavery, no money would be sent over to the Irish National Repeal Association. But he stood up grandly and defiantly, and said:

"Yes, I will say, shame upon every man in America who is not an anti-slavery man; shame and disgrace upon him! I don't care for the consequences. I will not restrain my honest indignation of feeling. I pronounce every man a faithless miscreant who does not take a part for the abolition of slavery. It may be said that offence will be taken at these words. Come what may from them, they are my words. The question never came regularly before us until now. We had it introduced collaterally; we had it mentioned by persons who were friends of ours, and who were endeavoring to maintain good relations between us and the slaveholders, but it is only now that it comes directly before us. We might have shrunk from the question by referring the document to a committee; but, I would consider such a course unworthy of me, enjoying as I do the confidence of the virtuous, the religious and the humane people of Ireland; for I would be unfit to be what I desire to consider myself, the representative of the virtues of the people, if I were not ready to make every sacrifice for them, rather than to give the least sanction to human slavery.

"They say that the slaves are worse treated since the cry of the Abolitionists has been raised in their favor, as it has made their masters more suspicious of them, and more severe against them; but has that any weight with me? How often was I told, during our agitation, that 'the Catholics would be emancipated but for the violence of that O'Connell'! Why, one of the cleverest men in the country wrote a pamphlet in 1827, in which he stated that the Protestants of Ireland would have emancipated their Catholic countrymen long before, but for me, and fellows of my kind; and yet, two years after, I got emancipation in spite of them. But it is clearly an insult to the understanding to speak so. When did tyranny relax its gripe merely because it ought to do so? As long as there was no agitation, the masters enjoyed the persecution of their slaves in quietness; but the moment the agitation commenced, they cried out, 'Oh, it is not the slaves we are flogging, but we are flogging, through his back, the anti-slavery men.' But the subject is too serious for ridicule. I am afraid they will never give up slavery until some horrible calamity befalls their country; and I here warn them against the event, for it is utterly impossible that slavery can continue much longer. But, good Heaven! can Irishmen be found to justify, or rather to palliate, (for no one could dare attempt to justify), a system which shuts out the book of human knowledge, and seeks to reduce to the condition of a slave 2,500,000 human beings—which closes against them not only the light of human science, but the rays of divine revelation, and the doctrines which the Son of God came upon the earth to plant! The man who will do so belongs not to my kind. Over the broad Atlantic I pour forth my voice, saying, 'Come out of such a land, you Irishmen; or, if you remain, and dare countenance the system of slavery that is supported there, we will recognize you as Irishmen no longer.'"

I wanted to say a word of what is called infidelity. Reference has been made to it several times on this platform during our meetings, and the first question that I would ask is, What have we to do with it, as a matter of criticism, of condemnation or approval, here? What right has any man to come to this platform, and point the finger at another, on the ground that he is an infidel, as though he were a depraved and dangerous man? Yet, so common is it, on the part of those who fancy that wisdom will die with them, and that they are really the representatives of Papal infallibility, though Protestants by name, that it comes as a matter of course for them to deal in this kind of speech. Now, we are here for one specific object. Suppose the city were on fire, and every person interested in saving it from destruction should be seen rushing to it, with all his might, to put out the conflagration. I ask you, would that be a time to talk about theological differences of opinion, or to attempt to define who was orthodox or heterodox? No—such conduct would be an outrage. I think that if, in the midst of the conflagration, any man should step forward and say, "I protest against working with that man at the engine, or passing the buckets with him, because he is an infidel; I am as much opposed to this conflagration as anybody; I am as much in favor of putting it out, as any one, but I cannot work with an infidel;" the people would say at once, "That is the villain who set the city on fire" (laughter and applause). It would be an act so absurd, so impertinent, so monstrous, that, unless the man could be considered insane, the solid judgment of the city would be that he set it on fire, or knew who did it, and wanted the city to be burnt down. What matters it whether a man who comes upon this platform is a Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Unitarian, Universalist, or so-called infidel? We do not come here to settle theological opinions, to subscribe to creeds, to point the finger invidiously one at the other. We must not do it. We are here to recognize the slave in his chains as a man, and his right to immediate freedom as at the hands of God; and if we agree upon this, let us leave the things about which we differ to take care of themselves elsewhere.

I hold that this term "infidel" is a mad-dog cry, raised for an evil purpose, and that, on Protestant ground, no man has a right to use the term "infidel" towards any other man, for differing in opinion from him, even though that difference be heaven-wide. What is Protestantism? Is it a Pope and Cardinals? No. Is it Councils to override individual conscience? No. It is the right of every man to do his own thinking, and to come to his own conclusions as to the will of God or what is right, and to obey his own conscience, though he stand alone in the universe. That is Protestantism. Now, then, on the ground of Protestantism, whoever is true to his own convictions cannot be an infidel, no matter what those convictions may be (applause). He may be in error, but he is not an infidel. The man who says, "This is my conscientious belief," and acts up to that belief, is a consistent man, and, showing in that act an earnest desire to be true to his duty, deserves respect. Among Protestants, infidelity is possible only in two ways. First, a man may be infidel to his own convictions; and if he is, brand him as such. Then, again, he may be infidel to his own pledges. He may promise to do what he ought to do, and break his promise; that is infidelity. Now, this nation is an infidel nation. Why? Because it declares that it "holds these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with an inalienable right to liberty," and then enslaves every seventh person in the land. Any man, any body of men, untrue to their own standard, are guilty of infidelity. Whoever is true to his convictions cannot, as a Protestant, possibly be an infidel. It is the old cry, as raised in all ages, to put down reform and progress. Have you ever thought of it? All the glorious martyrs of whom we boast in the world's history, including Jesus himself, were put to death on the ground of their exceeding wickedness, because they were infidels, heretics, blasphemers, and therefore deserving to be put to death. It will ever stand recorded upon the page of history that Jesus was put to death by those who claimed to be the very elect of God, on account of his diabolical wickedness. "He hath a devil; we have heard his blasphemy; what need have we of further witnesses?" And from the beginning of this glorious movement, one of the most effective and powerful devices to keep us from uniting together has been the raising of this cry of "infidelity" against those engaged heartily in this great work. Whereas, if there was ever a cause that has shown its faith in God, that has gone down to the root of things, that has been characterized by a lofty morality and a true religious spirit, it is the anti-slavery movement. It has had no arm of flesh to lean upon, only the arm of the living God. It has never relied upon numbers, but upon that truth which is mighty and able in due time to overcome all opposition. Still, we are not here theologically to settle anything. It is of no consequence what a man professes. What do I care that any man calls himself by the name of Presbyterian, or Methodist, or Unitarian, or Universalist? I do not know him by the name. These are idle terms; empty as the whistling wind; easily accepted, easily won. No, before I will give my judgment of him, I must put my finger upon his pulse; I must know the man; I must get his ideas of justice and humanity; I must know whether he dares to be a man; and it will be upo[illegible]ground that I will give him my homage, and not b he is a Presbyterian, Methodist, or Liberalist ap

What is a profession of faith in Christ worth country? Worth nothing. What does it pro country? Nothing, except that a man is in the fa except that he says what everybody says. Tha enough. What does it prove among Mohamme a man says, "There is one God, and Mahome prophet"? Nothing! Nothing of character as to the moral condition of the man. And country, to profess faith in the Christ of Am Christ that sanctions slave-breeding, slave-hu slavery-extension, why, it is to go with the to be on the popular side. It is of no value that has lost its savor. I do not care that a m he believes in Christ—I do not know him Let him show me that he believes in on Christ, stands in his day despised and reje that he sympathizes with the lowest and of God's creatures, and is willing to suff all things, if need be, that he may then I will give him my heart. The trying to perpetuate the old terms, supposing that there have been no new dences of hostility to righteousness, de tests than the old ones. They said to Jesus pretentious, dissembling Pharisees, "W We have Abraham for our father." But anything at that time to say that. Noth in the [illegible]. But in the days of Abraham an Abrahamite meant something. Here midst of Protestants. It is easy to say tants; it is not the slightest evidence when Luther nailed his theses on the out to meet the malignant opposition powers in Europe, banded to crush notion he inaugurated, to say, "I am a [illegible] the spirit of the man, and how m to suffer for conscience and in the cause [illegible]. What do I care that an Ameri "Hurrah for Bunker Hill! I glory [illegible] Hancock! Is not that marv [illegible] the highest respect for the m and John Hancock." No doubt of Caucus and demagogues, Democratic [illegible]-seekers, are saying these things a prove their emptiness by saying [illegible] must not go back to Luther. Luther ha [illegible] his day; Jesus his work in his day; [illegible] work in their day; and they did glorify Moses and Abraham, but 'Your hands are full of blood; wash clean; put away the evil of your doings mine eyes.'" "Woe unto, scribes, pharisees When the revolutionary war was launch tide of battle was sweeping onward, wh stood up against the colossal power of the [illegible] at the imminent peril of their lives [illegible], and showed what manner of men [illegible] for us now to have our Fourth of July as they are now observed, and declaim oppression, and boast what our fathers stuff! We ought to be in better business right to keep any day, save days of h and prayer, till "liberty be proclaimed the land, to all the inhabitants there

The other day, I received a copy of the terly work of Dr. Cheever, vindicating anti-slavery volume; and I think he has conclusively. I said so in my paper, an his work to the attention and considera have an idea that, somehow or other, Bible, has received the Divine sanction; "Nevertheless, the rights of man are not upon any parchment"; and, behold! your oracle of New York, claiming to be anti-s *Independent*, discovers in that simple truism rank infidelity and the utmost contempt for [Voices—"Shame."] Yes, the utmost conte Bible, when I say that the rights of man are no dent upon any parchment! Why, I was merely the Declaration of Independence: "We ho truths to be SELF-EVIDENT"—not pertaining particles or Hebrew roots, or to past ages, not any logic, not originating in any volume—"s that all men are created equal, and are endo their Creator with an inalienable right to And that is *infidelity!* That is to scorn the Bible. it will be charitable to believe that the man wh that article in *The Independent* is an idiot; oth it is evidence of Satanic malignity. How d contempt upon any book when I say that the of man grow out of man's nature? What or wh I dishonor when I say that? God, or man, or the No. I had said that Dr. Cheever had grandly d strated the Bible to be an anti-slavery book; and is such I have asserted for thirty years, against th interpretations of the pro-slavery clergy of this co they maintaining that the Bible, "as the word o sanctions slavery, therefore slavery is right maintaining that this Bible is a thunderbolt slavery to the dust (loud applause). I hold it perfect magazine of God's truth on that subject; there be any one sin in this world, more than an which is represented in that volume as abhor God, it is the sin of oppressing the poor and the that if any one thing is commanded in it, more another, it is to "proclaim liberty throughou land," "undo the heavy burdens, break every let the oppressed go free" (applause). Never whether the book goes for freedom or not, m made for freedom; whether the book is really side of human rights or not, human rights are ne be sacrificed. Man is man, and can never be slave; and if the book be made out as against li is simply proof that the book is not from God, bu from beneath, and ought to be sent there (ap I hold it to be everywhere refulgent with light u subject, but not originating man's rights, nor ar rights dependent upon it—though its glorious tr in entire accordance with the nature of man, an premacy of God over every soul. Hence I use it superstition—without accepting any particular in regard to it. I use it in season and out of sea there be any out of season with it), because its ciations against oppression are so tremendous, its ings so solemn and awful, its promises of the growing out of emancipation so grand and soul- —as the best weapon I can find against American sla

A VOICE—"Where do people get rights, except the Bible?"

MR. GARRISON—What is man? Who is he.

ANSWER—Created in the image of God.

MR. GARRISON—When?

ANSWER—When God created him.

MR. GARRISON—True. "So God created own image, in the image of God created he and female created he them." That was was any book, I believe (laughter and loud Was man without rights, and under no law that time? Man was before all books, is gr all books, and shall survive all books, and th book is equal to man (applause).

SAME VOICE—Where there is no Bible, the liberty either.

MR. GARRISON—Where there is the Bible, are four millions of slaves (great cheering). not this Bible-believing nation break every

VOICE—Speak to them, and not to us.

MR. GARRISON—I am speaking to them; and ask the question, I am branded as an infide

VOICE—I am as anti-slavery as you are, but like to hear anything said against the Bible.

MR. GARRISON—I am indicating the nature of disparaging the Bible:

> "How rich, how poor, how abject, how august,
> How complicate, how wonderful is man!
> Distinguished link in being's endless chai
> Midway from nothing to the Deity;
> A beam ethereal, sullied and absorpt;
> Though sullied and dishonored, still divine

Whatever tends to elevate man, of course is Bible, rightly understood and used, may b mendous weapon to beat down injustice The Bible, read superstitiously, read accepted traditionally, may kill, as the lette while the spirit in that case fails to make ali Whether it be infidelity or not, I say that man are not dependent upon any parchme *New York Independent* " may make the most cheers).

SAMUEL MAY, JR., on behalf of the Business C offered the following additional resolutions.

12 Resolved, That of all the Congressional manifest present session, no one is more dangerous to the cause slaved in this nation than the speech of Senator Seward York, on the admission of Kansas to the Union; and regar author as at present a most prominent candidate for honors, it is all the more significant as a declaration —a platform of Republican party faith—and a what shall be the character of his administration in the his success.

13. Resolved, That when, in the very exordium of promises and hopes "to allay the national excitemen proceeds to concede everything to the South and no North, and least of all to the slaves, softening the wo *Slaveholding* into *Capital* and *Capitalists*, reaffirming and ing every constitutional compromise ever claimed by endorsed by Webster, even the compromise of 850, Fug law and all, whose "inspiring sounds," reproduced in ral of the next President, Franklin Pierce, he affirms, and delighted the land" with hopes of peace from the tation and then declaring the only peculiar policy of be "the saving of the Territories of the United States, by constitutional and lawful means, from slavery and and again, that all our Northern system of labor ever works "equality of white men"; and farther, that should the tem [meaning slavery in the States] ever be assailed, gency, no matter what the cause or what the pretext or foe, we of the free States shall defend the Southern the equivalent of our own"; and then repeating the the assuring words, "we of the North are not the enemies friends and brethren, of the South, faithful and true," explains in what sense, by declaring his party to be "engag new transaction, not even a new dispute," though new sla should be admitted to the Union, and that Union throughou speech constantly lauded far above liberty—when all that more, if not worse, is embraced in a single speech by an for Presidential preferment, and he the most anti-slavery in his fession [and by the claim of his party] of the whole list of dates, the hour must surely have come when a government Union demanding such monstrous debasement should be dashed pieces with all the older, but not more bloody, tyrannies of times.

14. Resolved, That the sad and alarming departure of Senator Seward from many of his earlier utterances on the subject of slavery, particularly when, in the U. S. Senate, he ably and nobly vindicated the "*Higher Law*" doctrine as above all human codes or constitutions—when he bravely declared to the slaveholders, "we have had quite enough of Compromise"—and when more especially he

proclaimed, in the face of the world, the "IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT" between slavery and freedom—cannot but fill the hearts of all friends of the enslaved with the deepest disappointment, that one, whose promise was so fair, has finally fallen, under the seductive influence of selfish and political ambition, to a level with the demagogues that have so long scourged and cursed, as well as ruled, the land.

15. Resolved, That the doctrine proposed by certain Republican authorities, and inculcated in *The New York Tribune* and the late speech of Senator Wade in Congress, and recommended by late Republican Conventions in Missouri, Kentucky and Virginia, of colonizing the free people of color in some remote region, that so, in the significant words of Senator Wade, "*we may hear no more of negro equality in the North*," is a doctrine proscriptive and cruel in the highest degree, and any party which adopts it is incapable of comprehending the true genius and spirit of human freedom, and consequently wholly unfit to be entrusted with its interests.

16. Resolved, That the Church of the slaveholding States, that permits and practices the breeding, buying and selling of God's own image like cattle, trampling down marriage and the whole family relation, forbidding its own Bible and all other books to the enslaved, is most emphatically the synagogue of Satan! And every Church and minister in the North, that does not so regard and treat it, is false to the Christian name and trust, and therefore unworthy of countenance, fellowship or support.

17. Resolved, That we have seen, without astonishment, that slaveholders and their accomplices, in defending the accursed slave system, are driven to deny and ignore all the self-evident truths pertaining to Human Rights—that even their gifted and ever-zealous ally, the late Rufus Choate, in their behalf, sneeringly characterized the Declaration of Independence as a sounding tirade of "GLITTERING GENERALITIES!" But when an eminent teacher of religion, like Henry Ward Beecher, boldly inculcates that sin also is but another "glittering generality," that there is no sin in itself, that "nothing is bad *per se*, and nothing is good *per se*," and that "these are only scholastic subtleties," and that the great American Board of Missions is a true exponent of Christianity, and not only worthy of support, but is pre-eminently the chosen instrumentality for the world's salvation, notwithstanding that its religion includes slaveholding and slave-trading, even to the separation of parents and children: we are constrained to believe, from such revelations, that the age of wonders has not ceased, and that slavery has done its most fear [illegible] fatal work on the Northern Pulpit, though we cannot but rejoice [illegible] g and shameful position of Beecher is now revealed; [illegible] ven his brilliant eloquence and shining talents can [illegible] he people, perverting and poisoning the public character.

[illegible] That, while the whole field of emigration to foreign [illegible] opened to the colored people of this land as well as [illegible] while we must rejoice in every opportunity set before [illegible] their fortunes, yet we distrust all associated and systematic measures, by whomsoever set on foot, to induce this portion of our countrymen to forsake their own for foreign lands. And while we would do no injustice to any who, from good and generous motives, are engaged in upholding the African Civilization Society, we must declare our belief that, as a measure for freedom, it is of doubtful value, while, as tending to foster the wicked prejudice against the colored people, its influence is pernicious.

19. Resolved, That the imprisonment of Thaddeus Hyatt by the Senate of the United States for his conscientious refusal to appear as a witness before the Committee appointed by that body to investigate the facts pertaining to John Brown's interposition in behalf of the slaves at Harper's Ferry, is a usurpation of power not conferred by the Constitution and a dangerous infraction of the liberties of the people; and that we give Mr. Hyatt assurance of our gratitude for his brave resistance to this new exhibition of the insolence of the Slave Power.

Rev. **BERIAH GREEN**, in some able remarks, showed where the *real infidelity* of this nation lies. In the strongest manner he endorsed the truth of what Mr. Garrison had said, viz.: That human rights are antecedent to the Bible, and depend on no parchment. It is absurd, said Mr. Green, to suppose that God cares more for a dead book than he does for a living man, his own child. [Report next week.]

The resolutions before the Society were then taken up and put to vote, and were adopted, without a dissenting voice. And the Society adjourned, *sine die.*

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, *President.*

SAMUEL MAY, Jr., } *Secretaries.*
SUSAN B. ANTHONY, }

COLLECTIONS

For Expenses of Annual Meeting, May, 1860.

John Wickham	$ 50
Margaret Carpenter Pierce	50
H. F. Eles	1 00
N. H. Gale	1 00
John James	1 00
John S. Jenkins	1 00
Mrs. Beale	25
F. W. Seymour	1 00
Joel Smith	1 00
George T. Downing	1 00
Phebe Ann Pierce	1 00
Benjamin Bown	1 00
James Pierce	75
Elizabeth R. Post	1 00
Catherine Willis	1 00
George W. Rice	1 00
Frances A. Rice	1 00
Ann H. Senting	1 00
Emily Howland	1 00
James Barnett	1 00
James B. Richards	1 00
D. M. Allen	1 00
S. C. Barton	1 00
S. C. Burdett	1 00
Mr. Anderson	1 00
A. R. Bramhall	1 00
W. H. Woodbury	1 00
Samuel May, Jr.	2 00
Cash, in various sums	12 31
Amount of Collection, Tuesday a.m.	59 05

DONATIONS,

In behalf of American Anti-Slavery Society, at the Annual Meeting, May, 1860.

Marcus Spring, Esq.	50 00
Theodore T. Ovington	$20 00
Joseph Post	15 00
Elizabeth R. Post	5 00
Catharine M. Post	5 00
Joseph Carpenter	5 00
Thomas Garrett, Delaware	5 00
E. Cady Stanton	5 00
Pliny Sexton and Wife	10 00
S. W. Smith, Detroit	5 00
John S. Jenkins, Newburgh	4 00
Mrs. Blakesley, New York	3 00
Thomas S. Greenman, Connecticut	3 00
Rev. J. [illegible] W. Sloane	3 00
Mr. Wetherell, Philadelphia	2 50
Edward Gilbert	2 00
Rev. Jas. N. Gloucester	2 00
M. Griffith	1 00
Mrs. M. N. Beale	1 00

PLEDGES.

To American Anti-Slavery Society, May, 1860.

Francis Jackson	$200 00
Wendell Phillips	100 00
Samuel May, Jr.	20 00
J. B. Stephenson	10 00
George F. Noyes	5 00
[illegible]ta A. Mars (7 Nassau St.)	5 00
S. H. Bowne (51 Bond St.)	2 00
James Armstrong (110 King St.)	1 00
William Neely (348 Bowery)	1 00
Martha Hudson	1 00
[illegible]be T. Richmond	1 00
M[illegible]tte Richmond	1 00
Anna B. Rass	2 00
Caroline C. Smith (117 West Tenth St.)	2 00
I. J. Merrill, Abington	1 00

REPORTS OF SPEECHES.—We surrender nearly all our space this week to Mr. Yerrinton's admirable report of Speeches made at the recent Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Want of room, however, compels us to postpone till next week several Speeches not less interesting or less important than those which appear in our columns to day, viz.: those made by Mrs. J. ELIZABETH JONES, Rev. GEORGE F. NOYES, Miss MARY GREW and WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON on Wednesday morning, and those made by WILLIAM WELLS BROWN, Rev. SAMUEL LONGFELLOW and Rev. BERIAH GREEN on Wednesday afternoon.

We hope also to find room next week for the Speeches of Messrs. TILTON, PHILLIPS and GARRISON before the New York (City) Anti-Slavery Society.

TRIBUTE TO WM. STILL.

IN answer to the call for a public meeting of sympathy with Wm. Still, signed by twenty-nine of our most respectable and influential colored citizens, a large meeting convened at the Israel Church, corner of Fifth and Gaskill streets, Phila., on the evening of the 2d inst. Jas. M. Bustill was appointed Chairman, Morris Hall, Vice-Chairman, and Parker T. Smith, Secretary. A Committee, consisting of Rev. Jonathan C. Gibbs, Benjamin Hill, and Isaiah C. Wears, reported the following resolutions, which, after speeches by several persons, were unanimously adopted.

Whereas our worthy fellow-citizen and coadjutor, Wm. Still, has recently been compelled to submit to fines and imprisonment for performing an unpleasant though important duty, inseparable from his position as an active and zealous laborer in the Anti-Slavery cause and a good citizen; therefore,

Resolved, That in the faithful and unflinching discharge of his duty as an employee of a philanthropic society; as a benefactor to the public, by shielding the benevolent from deception, through his commendable vigilance and careful, conscientious discrimination of unpretending merit from specious pretension; as a devoted sympathizer and adviser of the hunted and outraged bondmen of this country, we assure him of our hearty sympathy and our unabated confidence in his integrity of character and fidelity of purpose.

Resolved, That while realizing the importance of tribunals of justice in a civilized country, and while respecting the great privilege pertaining to the legal profession and exercised by members of the same, neither obligations to a client, nor honor, honesty and fair-dealing justify the sweeping tirades against abolitionists, and the gross perversion of truth and misconstruction of motives, so often indulged in by men who, having drawn largely upon the resources of anti-slavery men in times gone by, when they were proud to be thought allied to them through professed unison of sentiment, now make haste to ally themselves to the slavery propagandists of the times.

On motion, the meeting adjourned.

JAMES M. BUSTILL, *Chairman.*
MORRIS HALL, *Vice-Chairman.*
PARKER T. SMITH, *Secretary.*

THE Twenty-Eight Annual Meeting of the Clarkson Anti-Slavery Society will be held at Oxford (Pa.) Friends' meeting-house, on Seventh day, the 26th inst., at 1 o'clock p. m.

ELIZABETH COATES, Sec'y.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 19, 1860.

CORRESPONDENTS will greatly oblige us by a careful observance of the following directions, viz.:

Letters enclosing matter for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "EDITOR OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, No. 5 BEEKMAN STREET NEW YORK."

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business of the office, should be addressed, "PUBLISHER OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, No. 5 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK."

TWENTY YEARS OLD.

IT is just twenty years since the first number of this journal was published. The circumstances attending its birth were so discouraging that even of those who wished it well, and felt that its existence was indispensable to the efficiency of the American Anti-Slavery Society, not one in a hundred saw any ground for hope that it would be kept alive for even a single year. The Society had been abandoned by all save one of its Executive Committee, and by a large majority of its most wealthy and influential members, who had formed a new and hostile organization, professing, indeed, to have in view the best good of the cause, but really animated by a sectarian and proscriptive spirit toward those who refused to join in the secession and boasting of its purpose to crush out the radicalism which dared to make a faithful application of anti-slavery truth to the American Churches. The march of the Seceders from the crowded Church on the corner of Catherine and Madison streets, led by one whose previous zeal in the cause had commended him to the regard and confidence of his associates, was imposing and triumphal, and those who remained faithful to the platform of the American Anti-Slavery Society placed in such trying circumstances, could only look up to Heaven and say, "God helping us, we will be true to the end, and never give up the ship." The faithless Executive Committee, anticipating the condemnation of their constituents, had robbed the Society of its newspaper, sold its books, and shut up its depository. It was in the face of these discouragements that the first number of THE STANDARD was sent forth, without a single subscriber, or any positive assurance that means would be furnished to continue it even for a single month. But the weakness of its friends has been made strong enough through their faith to keep it alive unto this day, and it now enters upon its twenty-first volume with a fair prospect of living to record the complete triumph of the cause to which it is devoted. It is in no unworthy spirit of exultation that, on the other hand, we remind our readers that the paper so unjustly wrested from the Society in 1840 met its death long since, and that the "new organization," of which it became the exponent, no longer has even a name to live. We see in these facts the hand of that good Providence which never fails to smile upon those who are found faithful in the day of tribulation, and to bring to nought the counsels of those who conspire against the cause of Freedom and Humanity.

THE STANDARD this week (thanks to its faithful printers) appears before its readers in a new and beautiful typography. Its friends will pardon us for reminding them that our only reliance for an increase of its circulation is upon their zeal and efficiency. The Society is without the means necessary to bring its claims to patronage before the public by advertising, and can only depend upon those who love the truth it is set to defend to recommend it earnestly to others who are groping for the light it is adapted to shed in their path.

If any of the papers with which we exchange should, out of good will to the anti-slavery cause, take this opportunity to commend THE STANDARD to the favorable regards of their readers, we shall be duly grateful.

THE ANNIVERSARY.

IT has been for a long series of years our happy duty to say of each of the Anniversaries of the American Anti-Slavery Society, as they succeeded each other in grand procession, that it was the best of all that had gone before. We are most happy to be able to say of the Twenty-Seventh of the order, that it is still, as it should be, in advance of any that ever went before it. This, to be sure, is a necessary fact in the history of the Movement, if those carrying it forward do but their simplest duty. They are pressed forward by the march of events, and have only to hold their own and keep in the foremost place which Providence has assigned them, to find themselves at each Annual Review of their forces in a condition of better preparation, an attitude of more dignity, and a position of greater weight and influence, than at any previous moment. We can, therefore, without the suspicion of vain boasting on the part of any persons competent to judge in the premises, exult in the prosperity of the Meeting which was held in this city last week, as a proof of past successes and the sign of victories to come.

The attendance was never so numerous, nor was the speaking ever more unexceptionably excellent. We have had more crowded meetings in smaller halls; but the immense space of the Cooper Institute could have swallowed up all the rooms we have ever met in, and yet not been satisfied. The actual number of thousands of souls that were reached by the utterance of the voice during this meeting was very much beyond that which ever received the truth through the hearing of the ear at any former one. This we feel it right to aver, as some of the political and religious papers, of the Satanic brand, have attempted to misrepresent the interest excited by this Anniversary by misstating its numerical attendance. We were also unusually free from the annoyances to which our sacred regard for the freedom of speech has sometimes subjected us. The speeches were all good and profitable for reproof of wickedness and instruction in knowledge. *The Journal of Commerce*, one of the chiefest of the pro-slavery politico-commercio-religious papers above alluded to, through that singular passion which seems to love a lie for its own sake, has seen fit to represent our sessions as always haunted by "at least one rank lunatic," who insists upon incessant interruption, which is submitted to as a matter of course. We think that even the editor of *The Journal of Commerce*, if present in the flesh, would have found it difficult to put his finger upon any such "flea of Conventions" at our last assembling of ourselves together.

The statements of the same veracious print as to the persons who took part in our discussions were marked by the same symptoms of chronic mendacity, which seem to indicate its case to be one hopeless of recovery. It says that the speakers were the same that had done the talking for the last dozen years. Though it would have been entirely immaterial if this had been the case, it was so far from the truth that none of the gentlemen or ladies, taking part in the meeting, could be said to be habitual speakers at our New York meetings, with the exception of Messrs. Garrison and Phillips, though one or two of them have occasionally spoken at them. The voices were fresh ones, almost all of them, that were uplifted on the slave's behalf at this his assembly. As the proceedings and speeches will be found in full in our columns, we shall spare the space necessary to any detailed remarks upon the speakers, or what was spoken. But we should do injustice to our own feelings, and to the just expectations of our readers, if we omitted to record the pleasure with which the appearance of Dr. CHEEVER upon our platform was hailed by all upon and before it. The cheering which the emphatic cordiality with which he grasped the hand of the President, as he came forward to speak, called forth, was a loud and sufficient witness of the spirit with which he was welcomed among us. It was a simple, yet a significant, expression of the fraternity which can join men of the most diverse opinions in a common unity of purpose and action for a great practical reformation.

They whose memory in the cause could run backward for twenty years could not fail to remember that it is that precise period which separated this Meeting from that of 1840, when the Secession took place, of which the pretence was the recognition of the rights of the female members of the Society to act and vote in its meetings, while the real reason was the wish to save the American Church from the blows to which her pro-slavery villanies justly and inevitably exposed her, in the necessary course of the conflict with the demon which she was sheltering in her pulpits and behind her communion-tables. That, indeed, looked like a day of small things. The great mass of the men most prominent in the Movement at that time left it, carrying with them the organ and the property of the Society. Affairs had a most gloomy look, as we held our session in Thomas Van Rensselaer's cellar, to devise ways and means and look out for men to use them. But as we did not take counsel of flesh and blood to avoid the split, we only strove to discover the pointings of duty and were guided into the ways of wisdom. We established this paper, which has survived all that have been set up, or kept up, in opposition, and have seen the American Society well served and well maintained, while its enemies have vanished, and the places that once knew them know them no more. Now we see clergymen of the first professional eminence, as well as of the most unflinching fidelity to principle, finding that the Anti-Slavery platform is one where they can stand, and the Abolitionists men with whom they can work, without any just impeachment of their theologies or their functions, for the conquest and destruction of the one great enemy of Religion and Liberty in the nation.

While we rejoice in the eminent success which has attended the Anti-Slavery Meetings of the last week fitly rounded by the immense gathering with which the City Society caused even the vast Cooper Institute to overflow—it is rather as a Sign than as a Success that we accept it. We see the effects of the Anti-Slavery Movement everywhere, in the State and in the Church. It has riven asunder the Democratic party at Charleston. The Irrepressible Conflict which it inaugurated entered even that Pandemonium, and the evil spirits could no longer be of one accord. It compelled the long-buried men of the Whig party to rise from their political graves and hold a Sabbath at Baltimore, in the hope that their gibberings might help slavery to the peace it sighs for in vain. And the Republican party, which it has called into being, is even now deciding with how little of the Anti-Slavery life we have breathed into it, it can have a name to live so as to reach the paradise of power and pelf. And we have been not less happy in the wholesome disturbance of the Sects in their worship of Slavery instead of God, in the breaches which we have made in the walls of their pro-slavery Zions, and in the blows we have been enabled to give to the great Babylons of Missionary and Tract Societies, in which they have hoped to hide their pro-slavery wickedness. We have made slavery the one absorbing topic of thought and discourse in the country—in high places and in low. This was the work we undertook to do, and we have done it, God helping us, with our might. It is only by this faithful antagonism to slavery that the liberties of the country can be saved from the toils of despotism which are fast encompassing us. The animating scenes and words of the last week, the daily history of the country everywhere, show the Abolitionists of the country what they have done. But they show yet more emphatically what remains to be done. To the future we now address ourselves.

SENATORIAL USURPATION REBUKED.

SYMPATHY FOR THADDEUS HYATT.

Dr. CHEEVER having declared, in his speech before the American Anti-Slavery Society, that there ought to be a public meeting in this city to rebuke the tyrannical usurpation of the Senate in the imprisonment of THADDEUS HYATT, a few friends of freedom promptly responded to his word and resolved that such a meeting should be held. A call was at once issued for Friday evening of Anniversary Week, at the Cooper Institute, and it was announced that addresses would be delivered by SAMUEL E. SEWALL, Esq., of Boston (of counsel for Mr. Hyatt and an early and faithful abolitionist), Dr. CHEEVER and WENDELL PHILLIPS. Though not a single one of the daily papers lent its aid to the movement, and not a single man representing the wealth and social influence of the city could be found to take part therein, the spacious hall was two-thirds filled by an audience eager to express its indignation in view of Mr. Hyatt's imprisonment and its sympathy for him in his unrighteous incarceration. The meeting was called to order by EDGAR KETCHUM, Esq., one of the few Republicans in this city whose manhood revolts from the treachery of *The Tribune*, and who, upon this question, has the courage to differ from his party. Upon his motion Dr. HENRY A. HARTT was appointed Chairman and OLIVER JOHNSON Secretary. Prayer was then offered by the Rev. HENRY T. CHEEVER, of Jewett City, Ct.

Dr. HARTT, on taking the chair, was received with much enthusiasm. He delivered a brief, but exceedingly pertinent address, after which the Secretary presented the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States, in the imprisonment of Thaddeus Hyatt for an alleged contempt in refusing to appear before a committee of that body, was guilty of a gross and dangerous usurpation of power, meriting the indignation of every American citizen (applause).

Resolved, That the hearty thanks of every lover of freedom are due to Thaddeus Hyatt for the courage and martyr-like endurance with which he has resisted the power of the Senate, and submitted to imprisonment in the vile jail at Washington rather than acknowledge the authority of that usurping body (loud applause).

Resolved, That the practice of legislative bodies to punish a citizen at their discretion for acts which they consider contempt of their authority—seeing that neither the offence nor the punishment is fixed by known laws, but depends largely on the discretion and passing mood of the Legislature—is one of the worst features of despotism, rests in reality on the principle of an *ex post facto* law, is utterly unjust as making one party not only judge in its own case, but executioner of its own sentence, and is therefore properly no part of the common parliamentary law adopted in this country, being wholly repugnant to the principles of the United States and every State Constitution, as well as utterly subversive of the rights of the citizen, and, however sanctioned by custom or heedless submission, should be met always with determined resistance by every lover of liberty (applause).

Resolved, That when an individual disturbs the quiet of a legislative hall, or refuses to obey the order of a Legislature, the only power it has over him is to commit him to the executive to await punishment, like any other law-breaker, and such individual is entitled to have his offence and his punishment described and fixed by settled and known laws, to trial before a jury, and to all the other safeguards that free institutions throw around the citizen, and that to admit any other power in a Legislature is to violate the cardinal principle of free government, and by mixing the legislative and judicial and executive powers is, in fact, to yield up sacred individual rights to party hate, personal caprice, or official discretion, which is but another name for despotism.

Resolved, That this act of the Senate, coupled as it is with contempt and denial of the rights of conscience, and making the bare will of the Senate to override every conscientious plea of the citizen, is an outrage upon Christian liberty, which should be stamped with the indignant repudiation of a Christian people (loud and continued applause).

The Secretary also read the following letter from the Hon. CHARLES SUMNER:

SENATE CHAMBER, 9th May, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR: It will not be in my power to be present at the proposed meeting in New York to protest against the false imprisonment of Thaddeus Hyatt but my best wishes will be with you and the faithful speakers.

To me the recent assumption of the Senate seems as unconstitutional and tyrannical as the Fugitive Slave bill itself, and I rejoice in every sign that Public Opinion will be aroused to correct such wrongs.

The power of the House of Representatives to institute inquiries into the conduct of any "civil officer" of the United States cannot be doubted, for this power is a natural incident to the power of impeachment which belongs to the House under the Constitution. But the Senate has no such inquisitorial power. This essential difference between the two branches of the Legislature has been overlooked by many who have hastily insisted that the Senate was justified in its recent dangerous assumption.

Accept my thanks for the invitation with which you have honored me, and believe me,

My dear sir, faithfully yours,

Edgar Ketchum, Esq. CHARLES SUMNER.

SAMUEL E. SEWALL, Esq., of Boston, then gave a brief account of the circumstances preceding and attending the imprisonment of Mr. Hyatt, and proceeded to discuss in an able manner the questions of law and precedent which the case involves. He showed by an irresistible line of argument that the Senate had been guilty of a most dangerous usurpation of power—a usurpation designed for the benefit of the Slave Power, and calculated, unless promptly resisted by the people, to undermine the foundations of liberty.

Dr. CHEEVER followed Mr. Sewall in an address which not only moved the feelings, but convinced the judgment of his hearers. Some passages in his address were sublimely eloquent and very warmly applauded. He read an extract from a letter received by him from Mr. Hyatt, as follows:

"I am at a stand still. My work, so far as I can at present see, ceased when, at dusk of the 12th day March—just this hour one month ago—the creaking of the hinges of two iron doors, as they were locked against me, put forever a seal upon my outward life, and established a bottomless and impassable chasm between the busy world and me. And by this one act of a heartless despotism my lips are sealed—my sentence being for life, or until I am ready to answer. I would not answer now though under my grated windows the sound of the same implements were heard, and for the purpose, as those which sent John Brown to heaven. I offered, when before the tyrants, to go voluntarily before any committee and give answers to any of their questions they preferred to [illegible]. Now they cannot have my answer at any price or on any terms. They profess to be satisfied—I know that I am. Were I an atheist, I should make a different bargain. Seeing now that my powder is wet (as some men count wetness), I am sorely pressed on all sides to give up my faith; but as I trusted God before the powder got wet (if it is wet, which I don't admit), I mean now to trust Him until it gets dry! These folks who quote Cromwell are atheists, my friend Cheever! Did it never strike you? Just crowd one of them and it takes but little squeezing to run out all their pretended trust in God: it is the powder, not God, they trust, and dry powder at that!"

Also this extract, dated May 9th:

"My friend, it is a question of endurance, if God sustains me. I can tire them out—and I will."

Now, said Dr. Cheever, we ought to be thankful to God, if, looking round in the streets of this modern Jerusalem for a man, a gap man, to stand in the gap for conscience and our liberties against this tremendous tyranny, he has prepared one, has created one, and has thrust him into the gap even by the very power of conscience, this inward, invisible, all-conquering power, that no despotism can measure, no tyranny cope with, no tyrant understand. God have mercy upon you, my friends, if, having brought you such a man upheld and driven by this inward power of conscience, and presenting for you this sacred plea, you yourselves prove yourselves so lost that you cannot even believe that any man in your time can have so much public virtue and so much sincerity of conscience, and so much real love of liberty left, as to be in earnest in such a position with such a plea. In revealing this impossibility of belief in the existence of such virtue, the conductors of some of our public journals have shown themselves more thoroughly allied in character and principle to that which we conceive as being the essence of a devil than they could have done by any other confession. It is the last utterance of a republic when a belief in the possibility of public virtue has gone out of existence. The body is [illegible] and fit only to be buried with the Coroner's inquest—died by the visitation of God—for all the life left in it is but that of princely fat maggots, and all that keeps it from the dunghill for awhile is the artificial salt of mercantile enterprise, that the hog may not putrify before the destined hour (laughter and applause).

* * * * There are occasions when the liberties of a whole country seem concentrated on one point, and in the hands of one or two men to settle. A self-sacrificing patriotism in one or two men may save a country. Arnold Winkelreid, receiving the sheaf of spears into his own bosom in the front of battle, and thus opening and breaking the Austrian phalanx, by sacrificing himself as a living wedge for the victory of his countrymen, was a most sublime instance. The event is one of the most thrilling in the records of Swiss patriotism; it has been carved in the living rock, and in language more lasting than the engraving. Our brother in Washington jail has received into his single heart a sheaf of Senatorial spears; but we trust in God, and in the people guided of God, they shall not prove fatal to him, but we will take the opening he has made to victory.

WENDELL PHILLIPS followed Dr. CHEEVER in an address to which nothing short of a full report could do any sort of justice.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON had not been advertised to speak, but he came forward at the earnest solicitation of the Chairman and others, and delivered an address which made a fitting conclusion of the meeting. He showed that the usurpation of the Senate was caused by slavery, and appealed to his audience to rally as one for the overthrow of that diabolical system. He said that if he had a hundred lives, he would be willing to lay them all down in the cause of liberty and free speech, and to rescue the nation from the grasp of the Slave Power.

The Rev. DANIEL WORTH, who was lately released from prison in North Carolina, came forward, in response to loud and earnest calls, and added a few impressive words; after which the resolutions were unanimously adopted and the meeting adjourned.

Our Washington Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, May 7, 1860.

THE Charleston Convention having burst into at least two pieces, some say four, there is the usual lull after an astounding peal of thunder. The excited, if not affrighted, multitude is a little quieted and given to reflection. The Democrats, North and South, are busy pondering events, and, if possible, will compass a compromise at Baltimore. I am not a little surprised at the way Mr. Greeley looks at this whole matter, both in *The Tribune* and *Independent* for I see he is contributing a series of political articles to the last mentioned journal. Mr. Greeley gives Douglas credit *for principle* in this matter! That a man who, in ten years of public life, has been on every side of the slavery question, taking that always which he thought would *pay best*, the man who repealed the Missouri Compromise to please the slave-drivers, who is notoriously one of the most corrupt, designing, ambitious and rowdyish of all our national politicians, should be singled out for commendation by honest Horace Greeley passes my comprehension. How any one who has seen Mr. Douglas here, and the ungodly crew he fraternizes with, who knows his character, his entire want of a moral nature, his dangerous schemes, can pronounce him in earnest, and honest in his support of Popular Sovereignty, is astounding. The whole secret of the rebellion, two years ago, on the part of Douglas, was to *save his Senatorial seat*. It was all that gave it to him, and even then the popular vote was against him. Was not this a purely selfish movement? And now at Charleston what were the motives of the North-Western Democrats? Simply *to save their lives*. Every mother's son of them had long ago been kicked from office by the people, and their only chance was to revive this Popular Sovereignty humbug; yet Mr. Greeley has no doubt they were animated by *principle*. This is a strong point for the fall canvass. Is it *true* that the entire quarrel was over Douglas and his nomination, and the chance afforded to the miserable Northern Democracy to rally against the Republicans? If so, it is a fact of the greatest importance in the contest, and the people will so regard it. I believe most fully, after seeing more than one Charleston delegate, that it was all a fight upon the spoils—a determination that *a man* should be put in nomination, rather than the adoption of a platform. If not, why did not the North-Western Democrats offer some other candidate upon the platform of their choice? It is encouraging, doubtless, to witness such a flare-up in the Democratic Convention, but don't upon that account whitewash Mr. Douglas and the New York Soft delegation into model saints!

The whole matter, as *The Tribune* and some other sheets treat it, will yet turn out a device of Satan to give the Slave Power another lease of power. Suppose Mr. Douglas wins the nomination at Baltimore and he has every chance of it, with these silly admissions, what is to hinder him from triumphing in several Northern States? If he carries enough Southern, he will make one of the most dangerous pro-slavery Presidents the country has ever seen. And if he does not carry them, the Southern candidate put up at Richmond will be elected by the House of Representatives—and this will be the result of putting a pretty, deceptive dress upon the Devil by gentlemen who profess to be his enemies.

There has been considerable talking in the House the last week, but no work. John Hickman's speech had the ring of true metal. What a passage is this:

"Sir, if ninety Representatives in this Hall can control one hundred and forty-seven; if thirty Senators yonder can govern thirty-six; if fifteen feeble States can rule over eighteen powerful ones; if minorities can overcome majorities, and weakness strength, let us not further degrade ourselves by whining complaints against the former; but let us, in as manly a way as we may be able to do so, acknowledge their superiority over us, and have it written down in the archives of the nation, that our children may understand it and learn their plain duty from it. If any one supposes I entertain a feeling of animosity towards my Southern brethren, let me here and now disabuse him. I commend them; I admire them for their boldness and success. But whilst I do so, I have an unspeakable contempt for that pusillanimity which enables them to exercise the one and to accomplish the other. I would have them imitated in their State pride and lack of gold-greediness; in their zeal, their energy, their frankness and their skill. If we were more like them, we would suffer less, and they would respect us more. They would not then secure all the powers of Government and all the patronage of office. Our Northern Presidents would be full-grown men; commanders-in-chief of the Army and Navy; executing the laws, suppressing incipient treason, and maintaining the spirit of our institutions. Our cringing Buchanans would be moulded into inflexible Jacksons, and the times of honesty and confidence, of quiet and good feeling, would be restored."

And this, about the "irrepressible conflict":

"That man who has read the history of his race, and has not closed his eyes against the plain teaching of events transpiring daily around him, will never be convinced that there can be an enduring peace between slavery and freedom. Truces may be agreed upon, but they will be like the compacts of kings, made to be broken, whenever interest, ambition, passion, or progress, shall will it. Air lines may define rival States, but they never can bound conflicting sentiment. The vigorous and the true will invade the sickly and the false. The light of the press, the mechanical agencies and other productions of highly cultivated art, the green fields and profuse harvests of scientific agriculture, the wide-spread wings of prosperous commerce, and the flooding wealth of ceaseless thrift, are not to be restricted by river banks, or corner-stones, or parallels of latitude. These influences are for ever and ever at work. They are your zealots, your fanatics, your traitors, your Abolitionists, eternally preaching of the noblest triumphs of civilization, and impressing their lessons upon the hearts of the most inconsiderate and wayward. They are the invincible antagonists of ignorance, indolence, sterility and poverty, and none but the unwise or disingenuous should attempt to deny it. When you can wall them in, you can control the travels of reason and the mightiest impulses of humanity. Then you may bind the influences of Pleiades and loose the bands of Orion. Then you may 'bring forth Mazzaroth in his season,' and guide Arcturus with his sons."

Mr. Seward never wrote anything to equal that paragraph. And talking of Mr. Seward, his chances are improving of late. The split at Charleston emboldens his friends, who claim that *this* is the time to make a fearless nomination—to put up a radical man. The friends of Banks, too are making a good deal of noise here just now; and if Mr. Seward is laid aside at Chicago, they will push him forward with considerable pertinacity. I know not why it is that the Republicans who reside in Washington, and the people who sympathize with the Republican party and the Anti-Slavery reform, seem to be almost unanimously Seward men. They do not feel one-half so timid in regard to a nomination as the Republicans who come from Pennsylvania and New England.

Depend upon one thing: *Mr. Seward has the game in his own hands.* A majority of the delegates to Chicago are Seward men; and if they do not go for him, it will be with the full consent and understanding of Mr. Seward and his political managers.

WASHINGTON, May 14, 1860.

THE grand, irrepressible conflict goes on in Congress, as you will see, and neither party leaders nor parties can quiet the agitation. Mr. Davis opens with a heavy [illegible]nade against Mr. Douglas and his squatter-sovereignty humbug. The Douglasites put forward Clingman, of North Carolina, to defend the Illinois rebel, when Benjamin, of Louisiana, brings his flying artillery into the fight, and drives Clingman and Douglas from the field. Mr. Clingman said that he was willing to support any of the men proposed or voted for at Charleston. Benjamin broke in very abruptly:

"I suppose so. Now, Mr. President, I am not. I am not willing to go for any man, I do not care whether his name has been proposed or not, who is not willing to stand upon a platform of principle of constitutional principle. I am willing to go for any man, whether named or not, who will pledge his honor to stand faithfully and squarely upon a platform of sound principles; and when a platform of sound constitutional principle shall be adopted by a Democratic convention, satisfactory to me with my views of constitutional right, and satisfactory to my people—principles satisfactory to my people, I say; I care not for men—then you may put upon that platform any man who can stand upon it honorably, and I will vote for him; I will maintain him; I will canvass my State in his behalf; I will spend all my time and all my breath in his cause, wherever, whenever, and however, I may be asked by his friends. That far, sir, I am willing to go; but I have no stomach for a fight in which I am to have the choice between a man who denies me all my rights openly and fairly and a man who admits my rights, but intends to filch them. I have no choice there. I can go for neither of these men; not that I admit or would suggest for a moment that anybody has any such intention; but I say that unless we can get such a platform of principle as shall secure the constitutional rights of the South, I will go for no man, the nominee of the Democratic party or not. If we can get such a platform, if we can get such an enunciation of principle to go into the fight on, then I will go with any man who will stand on that platform and honestly and honorably declare that he will carry it out. That far I can go; and if I cannot reach that point, of having a clear, open combat between principle and error, between right and heresy, then I am not in the combat at all; but I will join any third party that will join me in putting up a platform of principle, and putting on that platform of sound constitutional principle any proper representative honorably bound to maintain it. That is my position, and that is the position of the people of my State. If they can get a platform adopted at Baltimore which shall recognize their rights; if they can get the party pledged to uphold those rights, it is not too late; cheerfully and willingly will they come back into the Democratic fold. If that platform is not given, then they will not be the only ones out. If that platform is not accorded, then one after the other, every Democratic State that holds to principle and stands on principle, will follow the men who have given the gallant example; and then we shall see in our appeal before the country which is the true Democracy of the Union."

There you have the ultimatum of the Seceders "plain and flat," and here is the reason why the Cincinnati platform would not satisfy the slave States:

"Now, sir, the Cincinnati platform, with which the gentleman from North Carolina seems to be so much in love, and which he thinks is sufficient for the constitutional rights of the South, would be sufficient for that purpose, is sufficient for that purpose, properly construed; but when the delegates of a great party assembled together from all portions of the Confederacy recently met, and the proposition was made to them to adopt the Cincinnati platform, it was made under what circumstances and with what view? It was made with a knowledge of every man in that convention that two distinctly opposite interpretations were put upon that platform—one at the South, and the other at the North."

To-day, Mr. Douglas replies to the attack upon him, and thus the agitation is kept up; when the Republicans give the subject any peace, the Democrats get by the ears over it among themselves.

In the House, on Thursday, Mr. Bingham, of Ohio, reported the subjoined bill from the Judiciary Committee:

"Be it enacted, &c., That all acts and parts of acts heretofore passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico which in any wise protect, authorize, or legalize involuntary servitude or the enslavement of human beings within said Territory (except as punishment for crime upon due conviction) be and the same are hereby disapproved by the Congress of the United States, and declared to be null and void and of no effect.

"SEC. 2. And be it further enacted, That the following provision of the act of said Legislative Assembly approved January twenty-six, eighteen hundred and fifty-nine, entitled 'An act amendatory of the law relative to contracts between masters and servants,' be and the same is hereby disapproved and declared inoperative and void, to wit: 'No court of this Territory shall have jurisdiction nor shall take cognizance of any cause for the correction that masters may give their servants for neglect of their duties as servants.'

"SEC. 3. And be it further enacted, That sections two, three, four, five, seven, eight, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, nineteen, twenty, twenty-one, twenty-two, twenty-five, twenty-six, twenty-seven and twenty-nine of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the protection of property in slaves in this Territory,' passed by said Legislative Assembly of said Territory and approved February third, eighteen hundred and fifty-nine, be and the same are hereby disapproved by Congress, and declared null and void; and all courts and Territorial or Federal officers within said Territory are hereby prohibited from exercising any authority under or by virtue of any of the said sections of said Territorial acts."

This was a brave, bold movement and, unexpectedly, it was successful. Several Democrats and South Americans were absent, and the bill passed by a majority of seven. The territorial laws of New Mexico are unusually infamous, for they not only ostracize the free colored man, but authorize any employer to flog his white laborer to his heart's content without allowing the employee the right of prosecution. Several Republicans dodged the issue, and Eli Thayer, of Massachusetts, voted boldly against it. You are aware that this gentleman, who, a few years ago, was a flaming anti-slavery man, so radical and ultra that a common Massachusetts Republican would not satisfy him, that he now talks flippantly of "Northern fanatics," and ridicules as tomfoolery the intervention of Congress to prevent the spread of slavery. In other words, he has come out a zealous disciple of Douglas, and holds that Congress has nothing to do with slavery. He managed, on Friday, to lead off eleven Republicans to the Democracy, who, with these recruits, killed five bills for the organization of as many Territories, each bill containing a prohibition of human slavery in the Territories. A pretty exhibition, truly! Republicans *ashamed* of their own principles, and spitting upon them in Congress. The next thing for these gentlemen will be, I suppose, to take the stump *against Douglas*, that they may be reëlected to *support* his delusive humbug in the House of Representatives. The weakness of the Republican party consists wholly in their lack of courage and consistency. If they would stand squarely upon any decent platform, and, at all times, fight upon it boldly, with pluck and endurance, they would soon control the government. But the party doesn't seem to hold to anything as a unit. Some of its members like slave-catching, others don't. Some believe in prohibiting slavery from entering one of our Territories, and others believe in squatter sovereignty, and others still, like Mr. Corwin, are willing to let it go into the hot climates, where it will pay! The exhibition of Mr. Thayer is doing good, however, for it is agitating the professed principles of the party, and the question passes from one member to another, "*Are we ashamed of our principles, and, if so, how long can we expect to hold together?*" The result of the agi tion of the question will prove a gain to the cause human freedom, for every sensible member of the par perceives at once, on reflection, that to be strong, *party must be bold*. Of course, there are men fro Pennsylvania who will never go for anything except big duty on iron. They would sell their souls (if th have any) for an advance of one dollar a ton on the ir duty, any day. Such men, of course, "are tired of t everlasting nigger question," as tired as everybody el is of the eternal iron humbug.

The Senate has passed a miserable Homestead bi the shadow of the genuine bill which passed the Hous and the House has passed a Tariff bill to please Pennsy vania and New Jersey, and to make a little party capit for the Presidential canvass. These States must coaxed or bribed into doing right, I suppose, and, li some of the Irish voters, after getting their pay, th will cheat their managers. See if they don't. AVON

Our European Correspondence.

LETTERS FROM HARRIET MARTINEAU XX

April 23d, 1860

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SIR: The odd and disorderly scenes that take place occ sionally in Congress have the effect of drawing the attenti of European readers to the state of your great controvers on which their minds are so thoroughly made up in general way as to render the subject a tedious one. T chief use, however, which is made of such an exhibition took place during Mr. Lovejoy's speech is to discred popular government. The opponents of our pending Refor Bill have seized upon that scene as an illustration of t wisdom and manners to be expected in a legislatu returned by an indiscriminate constituency—unaware th Mr. Lovejoy, who kept his good sense and composure, w a true specimen of a popular representative, while t bullies who made the clamor were specimens of the Sout ern chivalry. It seems strange that a man like Lord Gre who has studied and transacted politics all his life, shou know no more of the history of your Constitution, and t formation of political interests in your Republic, than give such a representation of American politics as he did the 19th instant; and it may appear nearly as odd that great journal like *The Times* should know no better than say that Lord Grey's account of you was the best that cou be given. *The Times*, however, is so incessantly and pe sistently wrong in its views of American domestic politi that well-informed persons have ceased to expect tr information from it, and almost to speculate on the caus of such systematic error. Lord Grey's case is different. H is a good anti-slavery man, doubtless, indeed, he is changin about that as about other questions of reform. If there any English statesman more bound than another to kno and remember that the true democratic suffrage, pure a simple, never has been enjoyed by the American people, is Lord Grey. He must be aware of the three-fifths cons tuency of the slave States; and he ought to have studied t results of that provision enough to know that the evils misgovernment that you suffer from are of aristocratic a not democratic origin. We must try not exactly to tea him, for he is a man who cannot learn, but only go back but to expose the mistakes he committed, in his absu attempts to raise an alarm about the extension of the s frage here. Meantime, the dreadful corruption in yo administrative body, exceeding everything we have ev heard of outside of Russia and Turkey, gives a shamef advantage to the enemies of freedom in Europe. Your be friends know very well how all this corruption came abou and that it has no more connection with universal suffra than with the width of your rivers or the quality of your pra rie land. They know how to trace the operation of the poiso of slavery through your whole political history, from th first countenance given to it by the founders of the Republi up to the last disclosure of Maryland abuses; but if su men as Lord Grey can ground their opposition to an extensi of the suffrage on a mistake of aristocratic for democrat government at Washington, you may imagine that we watc with eagerness for a full and practical exposure of the trut on your side of the water, by a reversal of the pro-slaver policy of your singularly ignorant and ill-mannered arist ocracy of the Southern States, abetted by the mammo seekers and spiritless waiters-upon-Providence at the Nort What hope there is of purifying your Republic, in the a ministration of public affairs, we cannot judge; but it wou be a comfort to see the disgrace of its corruptions ca where it is due, and not laid to the charge of manhoo suffrage.

I see, by your newspapers, as well as hear by priva letters, that you have got Mrs. Browning's new "Poe Before Congress." Some of us may be conscious of absurd wish to put off the arrival of that book among yo under a sense of shame that any such book should hav been produced by such a woman. But, as it is actually your hands, there is nothing to be done but to see and to the truth about it. Those who know her mind after a stu of many years will be the first to protest against the natur supposition that she is guilty of the coarse and vulgar wo ship of success exemplified by the flatterers of the Frenc Emperor generally. Without disputing that his prese success blinds her to some things which will disgust her she lives to see his fall, we may confidently say that h aberration is mainly owing to an ideal and unpractical hab of mind which is no secret to her friends. There have be prior evidences of such misconception of the character persons whom she supposed she thoroughly knew as ma enable us to understand how she may fancy even Lou Napoleon a great man and a public blessing. It is a s pity not because any person in the world will adopt h view, in the face of existing facts, but because it is a mi fortune when literary genius diverges from its high path deal falsely with vice, and give fictitious names to a deprave ambition, and a tyranny and treachery unsurpassed in th history of the world.

The gloom has deepened over Europe since I wro last; but, to set against this, the bad faith of the Frenc Emperor and his ministers is now beyond the reach of que tion in any quarter whatever. It is a real consolatio though a dreary one, that there is an end of all doubt, a controversy, all loss of time and energy in arguing abou the meaning and character of the disturber of Europe. H seems himself to have left off making any pretensions political morality; and thus, the field is clear. Europ knows what to expect; and English people, at all even see no reason to suppose that a single nation of burglar ous propensities need be successful in its enterprises wh the whole neighborhood is duly alarmed. Since we hav been better prepared for any event, we English have cease to be alarmed; and other peoples may soon feel the sam by means of the same process. We have no idea tha France is really going to gain glory and extend her frontie as the Emperor proposes. Such a process cannot happ twice over in the same century. Defeat and mortificatio will be the result, if the thing is tried. The shame a injury is that it should be proposed or conceived of, throug the wickedness of one adventurer, carelessly indulged first, and now widely humored by the vile, instead of wit stood by the manly. The moment, too, seems to be unfo tunate; but it may turn out otherwise. One never can te Germany is deplorably weak. Russia is weak. It is easi to give the list of strong than of weak States. But the are centres of strength enough to keep France in order, to punish her aggressions. There can be no doubt abo the issue. It is the perpetual disturbance that is the gre misfortune. This man cannot be quiet for a month. H hand is at work in every country, aggravating all mischie and making new ones; and every few weeks or days says something offensive, or threatening, or flattering, promising, which keeps the whole world's attention fix upon the foreign policy of each nation. Why he cannot quiet, and mind his own business at home, and leave othe to mind theirs, he never explains. The circumstances of t issue will explain this, whenever it comes to pass. Mea time, what we know is that he is the evil genius of Franc and all Europe (and no small part of Africa, we may add, view of his colonial slave trade), and that an evil genius universally recognized as such never has a long term action.

We know no more at present than you do of the real fac of the attempted revolution in Spain, or the rising of th oppressed Sicilians. We well know what to wish in th latter case (and in the Spanish case there is apparent nothing to fear), but how far we may hope that Sicily c resist her tyrant we have no idea. A few weeks will sho

H. M.

WHEELER & WILSON'S SEWING MACHIN
WHO WRITES FOR IT?
SEND FOR A CIRCULAR AND SEE
OFFICE 505 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

BROWN'S BRONCHIAL TROCHES

COUGH, COLDS HOARSENESS and INFL ENZA, IRRITATION, SORENESS, or any affection of t Throat CURED, the HACKING COUGH in CONSU TION, BRONCHITIS, WHOOPING COUGH, ASTH CATARRH, RELIEVED, by BROWN'S BRONCH TROCHES, or COUGH LOZENGES.

"A simple and elegant combination for Coug &c Dr. G. F. BIGELOW, Boston

"Great service in subduing Hoarseness." REV. DANIEL WISE

"I recommend their use to PUBLIC SPEAKERS." Rev. E. H. CHAPIN, New York

"That trouble in my throat (for which the 'Troches' is a speci having made me often a mere whisperer." N. P. WILLIS

"Most salutary relief in BRONCHITIS." Rev S. SEIGFRIED, Morristown, Ohio

"Beneficial when compelled to speak, suffering from COLD." Rev. S. J. P. ANDERSON, St. Louis

"Effectual in removing Hoarseness and Irritation of the Thro so common with SPEAKERS and SINGERS." Prof. M. STACY JOHNSON, LaGrange, Ga., Teacher of Music, Southern Female College

"Great benefit when taken before and after preaching, as th prevent Hoarseness. From their past effect, I think they will of permanent advantage to me." Rev. E. ROWLEY, A.M., President Athens College, Tenn.

Sold by all Druggists at 25 cents per box.

Also, BROWN'S LAXATIVE TROCHES, or Cathartic Lozenges, for D pepsia, Indigestion, Constipation, Headaches, Bilious Affections, &

THE STANDARD.

ANNIVERSARY PROCEEDINGS.

[CONTINUED FROM FIRST PAGE.]

and what is right. It is not true that there is a class of sins which a man may not commit, and another class which he may "tolerate." All sin is *wrong* and intolerable by the spirit of holiness. And hence I have infinitely more respect for the "ordained theory" of Dr. Ross and his brother Netherland in regard to human slavery than for the "toleration theory" of those owlish theologians who blink the truth. Ross is candid, flat-footed and bold. The toleration theorists are a timorous crew, betraying consciousness of error and saying in an under tone Good Lord Good Devil. Hence they are driven by stress of argument to defend polygamy from the Scriptures. The Patriarch Abraham is claimed as the patron saint of the slaveholders. He had, it is alleged, 318 slaves on his plantation bought with his money. But he was also a polygamist; therefore polygamy is not wrong, especially as Paul says a Bishop must be the husband of *one wife*, clearly implying that all our Bishops in the Christian Church may have as many as they please. Thus they argue, and thus the same door that admits Abraham as a slaveholder is wide enough to admit Brigham Young with his score of wives!

Now the question I have to ask is this: how can the American Church make any headway against that class of sins forbidden by the eighth commandment, and which are so alarmingly prevalent at this time, when, in the most open and efficient way possible, it endorses before our own and all other people that giant system of *robbery* called American slavery? If we treat with respect Beelzebub, the Prince of the Devils, and endorse his religious character by bringing him to the communion-table, can we treat with disrespect the subordinate devils, whose name is legion, for they are many? The masses of men, both in and out of the Church, never misunderstand the bearing of *Christianity* upon any particular sin that is practised by them. They are entirely satisfied if they have the sanction of the *Church*. The Church that licenses the system of slavery, which is the sum of all villanies; licenses all other sins which flourish under its shadow. Hence the great Founder of Christianity said to his followers—"Ye are the salt of the earth" to prevent, by your example and teachings, the moral putrefaction to which human society is exposed.

The institution of *marriage* is Heaven's first great blessing to the human family. The union of one man with one woman in the bonds of holy love and confidence constitutes marriage as a Christian ordinance. So peculiar and mysterious is this affinity that they twain become one flesh. That spot on the round earth where true loving hearts reside, and enjoy the society of each other, is called in the Anglo-Saxon tongue "home." And if brightened by the smile of healthy and well-developed children, it is the anchor of a man's affections, the centre round which the joys and *sorrows* of domestic life revolve. It is a sacred place—so sacred that the English law declares a man's house to be his *castle*, into which even the king dare not intrude. The estimate put upon marriage and the family institution is an index to the civilization of any age or country. It is the nursery of the other two institutions—the Church and the State; for at home and before the child is six years of age, the character of the future man is formed. Hence all wise statesmen, in shaping the policy of government, encourage the establishment of families, and protect the sacredness of the institution. Now, there are three classes of persons in the United States who trample down this Divine ordinance: the *Free-Lovers*, the *Mormons* and the *Slaveholders*. The Free-Lovers are a small denomination of the Spiritual philosophers, formerly headed by Dr. Nichols of New York, and who openly teach that marriage is a restraint—that the passions ought to have unlimited freedom of choice. This class have one merit at least. They don't disgust us with cant. They don't honey over their pollution with evangelical terms and long faces. They don't father their brutality on the Bible, and steal the livery of the court of heaven to serve the devil in. They acknowledge themselves to be plain, unvarnished infidels, and complain of Christianity, and reject it, because it imposes a yoke upon them in this respect. The *Mormons*, under the lead of Brigham Young, have taken shelter behind the example of the Patriarchs and are polygamists. Among them there is no such institution as true Christian marriage. So loathsome is this system in its practical workings that Congress recently, by a vote of 114 to 60, declared it to be a violation both of decency and the law. The third class who trample down the institution of marriage are the *Slaveholders*. Let us call to the witness stand once more the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge. In defining the meaning of the term slavery as it exists among us, he says that slaveholders "reduce the slaves to the *necessity of universal concubinage*, by denying to them the civil rights of marriage; thus breaking up the dearest relations of life and encouraging *universal prostitution*." We might add to this the testimony of other distinguished Southern men and Church Courts; but it is true in morals as well as in mathematics that a thing once proved to be true cannot be made more evident by additional proof. Hence we are satisfied with the testimony of Dr. Breckinridge.

Now, here we have it in evidence that the marriage institution is entirely unknown among the slaves, as it is among the brutes of the barn-yard. All this springs legitimately from the atrocious doctrine of law, that the slave is not to be accounted a *person*, but a *thing*—a tool with a soul in it—an article of property to be bought, held, mortgaged and sold to the highest bidder, like the ox or the mule. He is stripped of every one of those rights which constitute his personality, individuality and accountability, and is placed in a condition where it is entirely out of his power to fulfil his duties as a husband, a father, a child, a citizen, a subject, a Christian. Hence it was agreed long ago by English jurists that if a slave obtained baptism, which was the sign of conversion, publicly or by stealth, it was equivalent to emancipation, because the condition of a slave was deemed totally incompatible with the rights and duties of a Christian husband, father, or subject. It was a conflict of jurisdiction between God and the master, and the master must submit. Here then are four millions of American citizens, reduced by law, according to the [illegible] Breckinridge, to the necessity of universal concubinage! Here is Free-Love on a large scale, and on principle! Here is a type of Mormonism, more loathsome and abhorrent than that of Brigham Young or Heber Kimball! Here is one vast Sodom and Gomorrah, within whose limits you will find not one married man or woman, but all living like the brutes, in universal prostitution! And these wretched compulsory free-lovers, polygamists and adulterers are in thousands of instances members in full communion in the Church! In the Old School Synod of South Carolina, 5,009 out of 13,074 church-members are such characters. In the Presbytery of Charleston, 1,637 out of 2,889 members, or considerably over one-half, are known and notorious adulterers and adulteresses. Dr. Adams, the author of the South-side View of Slavery, says they are remarkably *pious* and good Christians! Christian fornicators! pious adulterers! devout heathen, as ignorant of the Scriptures as they are of the Pandects of Justinian! conscientious, praying *thieves*—for all Southern testimony confirms the statement that the slaves steal. The slave church at Savannah, whose piety was so much lauded by Dr. Adams, on one sacramental occasion procured a keg of wine, allowing, at least, a pint to each communicant, under the influence of which they went through the Bacchanalian orgies, to the great admiration of Dr. Adams and such like.

Now, how can we, as Christians, stem the tide of licentiousness that has made our cities so corrupt, and is flowing like a mighty wave all over the land, when we sanction it on a gigantic scale in the very heart of the nation? How can we rail out against Dr. Nichols's free-love schemes, when our Churches publish to the world every year the number of adulterers and adulteresses they have received in full communion? If violations of the 7th Commandment are wrong in New York, are they not wrong in Virginia? If adultery and concubinage are right among church-members in South Carolina, are they wrong in Philadelphia and Pittsburg? Are vices and crimes different in character according to the color of those who commit them, or the degrees of longitude and latitude where they may be committed? But it may be said that the slaves do not herd together like brutes—that Dr. Breckinridge is mistaken; that in many cases there are marriages among the slaves, solemnized by regular clergymen. Granted. This makes matters worse than ever! Only think of a minister of the Gospel, with the vows of God on him, solemnizing a marriage between slaves, obligating them to mutual love and constancy till separated by death, when he *knows* that they are liable to be sold away from each other at any moment by the will of the master! Only think of a clergyman, after the contract is made between the parties, declaring, "I pronounce you husband and wife according to the ordinance of God: what, therefore, God hath joined together let not man put asunder," when he knows and admits that the master may and does separate them at his pleasure! No Justice of the Peace in a Southern State was ever known so to trifle with sacred and divine things, as to officiate in the marriage of slaves. He knows that slaves are not accounted persons, but things; of whom, or *which* the marriage contract could not be predicated. But this indignity and outrage upon this divine institution is committed by the minister of the Gospel, the very man who is bound by solemn oath and promise to defend the truth and the institu-

cal outrage, during the French Revolution of '93, when the infidel and apostate priests of that day, to show their contempt of Christianity, took cats and dogs and baptized them in the thrice holy name of God! But a similar desecration of another divine ordinance is now committed in the United States, not by professed infidels and renegade papists, but by Protestant ministers of the Gospel! To be sure, against all this Dr. Cheever is lifting up his voice, like one crying in the great wilderness of New York; but among your million of inhabitants, who hears or heeds him? And a few hundred ministers in the West are engaged in lifting up their testimony in like manner. But these, composing a very small minority of the whole number in the United States, exert but a feeble influence comparatively. Christianity, to effect a reform, must utter a *united* testimony. The South declares of Dr. Cheever in the East, and John G. Fee in the West, that they are *crazy fools*, as Lovejoy in Congress was pronounced to be recently, when he opened his battery of Paixhan guns upon slavery. And they cite *The Presbyterian*, *The N. Y. Observer* and nearly all the ministers of the gospel to prove the charge.

If *all* ministers of the Gospel and *all* religious newspapers would *combine* their utterances with Cheever and with Fee, the system of slavery would receive its death-wound within the next 365 days. There is no system of organized iniquity under heaven that could long resist such influence. It would fall like Dagon before the ark of God! Gibbon, in his "Decline and Fall," says that Roman slavery gave way before the pure and peaceful institutions of Christianity in a hundred years after the advent of Jesus Christ. Why? Because the verdict of the Christian Church was *unanimous*. There were no Nehemiah Adamses, no Dr. Springs, no Lords, Doctor or Eleazer, to drown the voices of the Fees and the Cheevers. The Church at Jerusalem did not vote Peter to be a crazy man when he went down to Cesarea and preached an anti-slavery sermon to Cornelius. The ministry of that day were all of *one heart* and *one mind*, and hence the triumphs of the Gospel. Christianity had a *chance*. She had a fulcrum for her lever, and therefore she overturned the pagan institution of slavery. Christianity has no such chance now in this country. The authenticated channels of her influence are corrupt, and she is made, by false friends, to patronize the crimes of heathenism. While I speak, the ploughshare of ruin is driven through the family institution of four millions of people who are reduced by law to the necessity of living, like brute beasts, in universal concubinage and prostitution. And yet the Church, with few exceptions, professing to be the pure spouse of Jesus Christ, looks on and has nothing to say against the outrage. Can we wonder at the laxness of morals in the world around us? Is not the gross licentiousness of the day, which fills the heart of every considerate parent with alarm, the natural consequence of our connivance, palliation, excuse and justification of the colossal system of debauchery which goes by the name of the domestic institution? How can New York Christians frown upon the morality of the "Five Points," when we have in the Church, and supported by the Church, according to Southern testimony, a whole Sodom and Gomorrah, reeking and festering with moral pollution and pestilence? The reason why we church people cannot open a fire upon the vices of the times is because, when we come to unlimber our guns, we find they are spiked by our inconsistency. The criminals we would reprove echo in our ears the reproof and the philosophy of Paul—"thou that preachest men should not commit adultery, doest *thou* commit adultery?" And Paul himself says to us, in thunder tones louder than the rebukes of the adulterers, "the name of God is every day blasphemed among the Gentiles of New York, Philadelphia and Pittsburg, *through you*."

The conduct of the American Tract Society in regard to this whole subject is both criminal and humiliating. Its doctrine and policy concerning slavery have been that of *total silence*. In carrying out the professed ends of its existence as a reformatory association, it has published tracts on the sinfulness of dancing—tracts against reading novels—tracts against horse-racing—tracts against the sinful practice of smoking, chewing and snuffing tobacco—tracts against the sinfulness of going to sleep in meeting, although not one of these things is specifically named in the Scriptures. But not one page, sentence, line or syllable, have they ever uttered against that hideous system of robbery, concubinage and heathenism, known as American slavery. They have a wonderful sympathy for the heathen on the other side of the globe, but none for four millions of imbruted slaves who are perishing under their own eyes. And, what is worse still, they have beslobbered over their cold-hearted indifference to the slave and his master by the use of those tender and touching terms in evangelical phraseology which are so dear to the hearts of thousands, and which they use as a cloak to deceive and dupe their simple and confiding patrons. It will take a whole generation of active Christian effort to root out from the minds of our countrymen that contempt for evangelical religion superinduced by the jesuitical conduct of the oligarchs who control the Tract Society. Little do those men think that their truckling servility is despised by multitudes of high-minded men in the South, who instinctively scorn cowardice, and unfaithfulness and cant.

The people of the United States have been thrown into amazement at the repeal by Congress of the Missouri restriction—at the tragical events attending the efforts to fasten slavery upon the unwilling people of Kansas—at the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Dred Scott case, and the opinion of the President expressed in his New Haven Letter, and his Message to Congress, that slavery goes into the Territories by the Constitution. What is all this but bringing the nation down to the level of the Church and the Tract Society on the subject of slavery? If slavery be a Bible institution, recognized as such by Christ and his Apostles, why not carry it into Kansas? If it is good enough to be baptized in the name of the Trinity and to come to the communion-table in the Christian Church, surely it is good enough to go into the Territory of Nebraska? The Republican party in a few days will select their candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States. One thing you may rely upon. They will not nominate a slaveholder. The Chicago Convention would not dare to insult the voters of the party by such an act. What a contrast, then, is presented in point of *religion* and *morality*, between this political party and the pro-slavery Churches?—men making their politics purer than their religion! For these very criminals, who would not be thought of as suitable nominees for *political* office, would be welcomed into the communion of the Church! There are many evidences of Christianity mentioned in books which treat on that subject. But there is one proof of the divine origin of this religion which is not in the books, but which exists in the United States alone, and is overwhelming in its force—the fact that the corruptions and hypocrisies of the slaveholding Churches have not been able to bring it into complete and utter contempt. Surely a religion that can survive the suicidal stroke of its own professors must be divine and imperishable.

In the midst of the distress and embarrassment that fill our minds in the contemplation of this subject, I must offer one remark of explanation, if not of palliation or excuse. Slavery did not *break* into the American Church like a *burglar*, with force and arms. It crept into the sacred enclosure, as the Devil did into the Garden of Eden, in the form of a serpent. At the close of our Revolutionary struggle, it was understood by our fathers, North and South, that it had received its death-wound by the moral power of the Revolution, and that it could not possibly survive the year 1808. But the snake was scotched, not killed, and on the settlement of the Church's affairs it dragged itself into the *vestibule* of the building. Soon, however, it received strength and impudence enough to glide up stairs into the gallery, where, by a compromise, it was allowed the coldest corner of the house. Encouraged by toleration, it came down one of the pillars that supported the gallery and took up its quarters below stairs. There, in process of time, it found its way from the pews into the pulpit, where it now lifts its brazen crest and flashes its fiery eyes and shoots out its forked tongue beside the very minister of the Gospel, paralyzing him with fear, or charming him into silence by its fascinating look!

But we approach now a point in this discussion of vast importance, viz., the effect of this complication of the Church with slavery, in producing *infidelity*. Dr. Wayland, in his letter to the Investigating Committee of the Tract Society, writes thus:

> Are we not as much responsible for the salvation of one class of men as of another? By presenting a mutilated view of Christian duty, and apparently conceding that the Gospel allows of wrongs at which humanity shudders, we place in the hands of unbelievers an argument against the divine origin of revelation difficult to be answered. God created the conscience of man, and endowed it with its moral impulses. To believe that to be a revelation from God which allows of the commission of acts, from the commission of which the natural conscience of those to whom it is given revolts, is impossible. I do not say that we must of necessity disbelieve it, only that we cannot possibly believe it. That precisely this effect has been produced already, by the manner in which Christians have dealt with the subject of slavery, there is too much reason to believe. Are we authorized to seek the salvation of some men by means which must ruin the souls of other men, and especially are we authorized to do this by the suppression of that which we believe to be important truth?

Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, uses similar language. In addition to this, we cite the authority of the Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky in their celebrated Address on the subject of slavery. They are replying to the objection that God's Word sanctions Greek and Roman slavery, and that, under this example, the Church now ought to sanction *American* slavery. "Brethren," says the Synod, "could any man insult "the God of Heaven more than by declaring that he "does not disapprove of such a system? Before we "can admit so *monstrous* a doctrine, we must reverse "all our ideas of the attributes of God. If any man "would construct a more powerful argument against "the Divine origin of our religion than infidelity has "ever yet invented. A religion that sanctions a system of atrocious cruelty can never have come down "from Heaven." Thus speaks the Synod of Kentucky. Let me remind you now of the position taken by the Church in these degenerate times, with a view of showing that ministers and Churches have actually forged the weapon alluded to by the Synod, and placed it in the hands of infidelity. The position taken by the Church is *not* that the Bible authorizes American Christians to enslave the *negroes*, as they allege the Jews were authorized to enslave the Canaanites. If it were simply this, then, we Anglo-Saxons, with our children, might escape from the sweep of the principle, for we are white. But the ground deliberately assumed, both by priest and scurvy politician, is that slavery, in the *abstract* as well as in the *concrete*, is right—that one man *may* hold property in another—that the Bible sanctions the relation of master and slave—that birth and the color of the skin are mere incidental circumstances, not affecting the application of the *broad general principle*. Now, in the revolution of the great wheel of Providence, *we* may fall into the hands of the Algerine pirates, as our countrymen have done before. Or, as Thomas Jefferson contemplated, the slaves of this country may increase, like the captive Jews in Egypt, to such a degree that we and our children may change places with them. Thus the poisoned chalice which we have put to the lips of the American bondman may be commended to our own. Suppose, then, when we drink it to the dregs, our black task-master should bring forward, as we do now, his learned dissertation on *doulos* and *despotes*, and try to convince us that our bondage is a Bible institution, and that we ought to submit! Ah, the very moment a man feels the iron of slavery enter his OWN soul, he repudiates with abhorrence, and hates a religion that justifies such crime. There are thousands of quiet, intelligent, humane, reflecting men in this country who profess to have no experimental acquaintance with Christianity. They go to church [illegible] it is fashionable—mere lookers-on in Venice [illegible] political papers of the day, they have been [illegible] the crime of slavery and its danger to the [illegible] They hear ministers in public and private defend, not the practice of slavery, for that is comparatively a peccadillo, but the *broad abstract principle* which would justify the enslavement of any man or any race, and the consequence is that they turn away with loathing and disgust from all religion. To be sure, such a man may attend church, for if he be a lawyer, or an editor, his clients and patrons may be there. Or if he be a physician or a merchant, his patients and customers may be there. But secretly and at heart he is an infidel, and made such by the influence of the Church itself! And yet these very men, after they have filled their congregations with hypocrites and infidels, have the impudence to stand up in the pulpit and curse their own progeny. Nay, worse—they launch their anathemas against that very class of Good Samaritans who, in imitation of and in obedience to Jesus Christ, are laboring in the cause of downtrodden humanity. I put it to every honest man, to say whether, if Jesus Christ were to come back again now, he would not recognize and consort with the anti-slavery men of the United States in preference to that large class of supercilious Pharisees who breathe the language of treason and infidelity on their lips, and keep the price of blood and of silence in their pockets? I know and rejoice that there are denominations of Christians in this land that have nothing to do with slavery. They occupy the true Christian ground, and have banished it from the Lord's house altogether. But they are all *small* denominations, not known by the *nation* at all. They are regarded with indifference or contempt by the large national organizations, which are all slaveholding bodies. The nation and the world see only these *large* Churches. The late fraternal letter from the Protestant Churches of France was addressed "to the Churches of the United States" without exception, taking for granted that all were slaveholding, whereas there at least six evangelical denominations in the country which are nohow connected with the evil.

To give you one more illustration of the way in which evangelical men stab the cause of Christianity and obliterate the eternal distinction between right and wrong, let me call your attention to a historical fact. At the Fall term of the Supreme Court of South Carolina, some years since, John L. Brown was indicted for "inveigling, stealing and carrying away" the slave Hetty, the property of Mrs. Charlotte Hinton. Brown was a free man of color, and Hetty was his affianced wife. They went down to Col[illegible] together. *She* was apprehended and lodged at that place. Brown returned immediately to [illegible] field and declared that he had no intention of *stealing* Hetty, but thought she had leave [illegible] master to go to Columbia, where he was go[illegible] obtain employment. It appeared in evidence [illegible] trial that for nine years Hetty had been allowed to hire her time and go where she pleased, she giving her earnings regularly to her mistress. The case, after argument, was submitted to the jury by Judge John B. O'Neal, and the jury upon their oaths convicted Brown of the offence, punishable by the laws of South Carolina by *death*. He appealed by his counsel to the Court of Appeals, and the case was argued with great ability. The opinion of the Court was delivered by Judge Evans. The motion for arrest of judgment was dismissed on all the grounds, and the application for a new trial was refused. Ten days afterwards, Judge O'Neal pronounced the sentence of death upon Brown. I have the document in my possession. Shall I read it to you? No. I will not. "You are not wood, you are not stones, but men," and if I should read it, you would grow cold with horror, and "each particular hair would stand on end, like quills upon the fretful porcupine." No sooner had intelligence of this conviction and sentence been carried across the Atlantic than it filled every soul with horror and every mouth with words of indignation. In the British House of Lords, Lord Brougham called attention to the case. Lord Denman, the Chief Justice of England, when the news arrived, was at a distance from London at the Assize Circuit. But he hastened to his place in the House of Lords, and there, as the head of the law department in the empire, raised his testimony against the decision and sentence of Judge O'Neal as a flagrant violation of just and civilized law. Two thousand people assembled in Glasgow at a public meeting called for the purpose, and the whole Christianity of that Scotch city spoke of the outrage as it deserved. Judge O'Neal having quite a reputation for being a *Christian*, a large meeting was called at Edinburgh by the magistrates and Town Council, and the ministers of the Gospel in that city attended and spoke the same language that resounded in the House of Lords. Remonstrances and petitions were presently addressed to this evangelical butcher, chiefly from the British Isles, and such an amount of the world's detestation was brought to bear upon the guilty officers of the law that poor Brown's life was saved. But what of all this? Well, while the thunders of rebuke were still echoing over all Europe, and before the blanched faces of good men everywhere had regained their natural color, and while the name of O'Neal was everywhere used in damning connection with those of Jeffreys and Scroggs, the American Bible Society, as if to defy the whole Christian and legal world, elected this judicial monster to the honor of sitting beside Theodore Frelinghuysen as Vice-President of the Society! Who can wonder, after this, if the Hon. Nena Sahib, of Cawnpore, if he be still living, shall be announced this month as another Vice-President, to sit beside his worthy brother O'Neal at the anniversary of the Bible Society!

This, then, is the bill of indictment I draw up against American slavery as patronized and sustained by the American Church. As a citizen, I charge it with being the enemy of my country—with hindering the beautiful and harmonious working of our system of free political government, by throwing into its machinery a foreign element eternally hostile to the government itself. I charge it with every drop of blood that has been shed on the soil of Kansas, in its wicked attempt to fasten the curse of human bondage upon an unwilling people. I charge it with seducing with the wine of its sorcery hundreds of our public men to their ruin and self-degradation. I charge it with the cold-blooded and deliberate murder of Daniel Webster, the prince of American orators and statesmen. I charge it with the political death and destruction of Franklin Pierce, who wanders, like Cain, with the blood of the martyrs of Kansas on his hands! I charge it with offering the knife of suicide to James Buchanan and with having already dug his political grave deep and along side that of Franklin Pierce. I charge it with all our Congressional quarrellings and distractions—with fomenting and setting on foot filibustering expeditions and causing all those sores that disfigure and weaken the body politic.

As a Christian, I charge it with plundering four millions of laborers of all their hard earnings from one generation to another, thus teaching the American people, both by precept and example, the great lie, that slavery is neither a sin nor a shame. I charge it with taking away the Bible from four millions of its victims, imbruting their minds in heathenish darkness, and then turning round in its impudence and cursing the Catholics for doing the same thing. I charge it with rolling back the tide of Christian civilization in the South two hundred years, and drying up the fountains of benevolence and good will to men; for the Sandwich Islanders, who, fifty years ago, were worshipping idols, now pay into the treasury of the American Board of Missions more money than all the slave States of the Union put together. I charge it with forcing millions of our citizens and church-members to live in concubinage and universal prostitution, by denying to them the civil rights of marriage, thus proclaiming another grand lie, that human beings, in

dates for heaven. I charge it with making a jubilee in hell and mourning in heaven, by getting up revivals of slaveholding religion—a religion that sells its own converts for money—a religion of whips and thumbscrews, of manacles and branding irons. I charge it with breaking up our whole system of morals, with seducing hundreds of our ablest men in the Church to make written defences of its claims—thus wrecking their reputation with the future, and preparing the faces of their posterity to be reddened with shame at the apostacy of their fathers. I charge it with stabbing the cause of evangelical religion, by fathering upon that system all the vices, pollutions and outrages of slavery, thus driving men away from the Church by thousands. I charge it with opening the floodgates of the most dangerous form of infidelity the world has ever seen—with unsettling the moral convictions of men, and driving to distraction, despair and atheism, thousands and thousands of our countrymen. I charge it with misrepresenting Christianity to the American people—with running up false lights, like pirates upon a dangerous coast; and when the opinions and the hopes of men are dashed on the rocks of scepticism, with sneering at their misfortunes and making capital out of their ruin. In the name of the Irish Presbyterians, whose fraternal rebukes it has treated with contempt—in the name of the Scotch Presbyterians, whose brotherly remonstrances it has unheeded—in the name of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, whose affectionate entreaties it has despised—in the name of the whole Protestant Church of France, Switzerland and Belgium, whose faithful letters of warning it has not permitted the people to read—in short, in the name of all Christendom outside the limits of the United States, and in the name of all God's faithful witnesses for the truth and righteousness of the Gospel inside the limits of the same, I pronounce the system of American slavery to be a crime and an outrage from which the Church of the Living God should deliver herself, and a stench and a nuisance which the government of the United States ought to [illegible]. And as to those politicians, statesmen, ministers of the Gospel and editors of religious papers who [illegible]ly uphold the accursed system, my only prayer [illegible]em is the prayer of the dying Savior. "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." And whatever policy other men may pursue in regard to this great evil, believing as I do in the glorious yet awful truths of Christianity, I shall continue to make war upon it while I live, and go down to death and up to the judgment of the Living God with clean hands and an honest heart!

Mr. BRADFORD's speech was heard with deep interest and pleasure, and at various points heartily applauded.

The PRESIDENT—It is nearly twenty-seven years since the American Anti-Slavery Society was organized in the city of Philadelphia. Among those who were present at that time was the gentleman who is to address you now, whom I am glad, most glad, to welcome once more on this old platform, and one whom you will be glad to hear—I mean our friend, the Rev. BERIAH GREEN, of Whitesboro', in this State.

Speech of Rev. Beriah Green.

Of those whom I now venture to address, very many doubtless repeat the name of Wm. H. Seward with confidence and admiration. They describe him as a great man, an acute metaphysician, a profound and comprehensive philosopher, a model statesman. They are eager to place him, as the presiding genius of the nation, in the highest place of the Republic. Now, I would not willingly offend them; I would not wantonly wound their feelings—I come hither for no such purpose, I speak not as a partisan. I belong to the human family, and I am one of those for whose benefit the late speech of Mr. Seward in the United States Senate was published. I know not how I can treat its principles with greater respect than earnestly to examine them, and weigh the statements which he makes, the doctrines he inculcates, and the conclusions he commends.

It may not be amiss, in the outset, to advert to the general position which, in this remarkable speech, the Senator assumes. He gives us, in all essential particulars, the construction under which he pledges himself by a solemn oath to obey her organic law, to support the Constitution. He inquires what position, if a fugitive from slavery were to approach his residence at [illegible] still hour of midnight, weary, hungry, tempest-[illegible]sed, desponding, and were to seek at his hands [illegible]pathy, shelter, protection—what position, according to our organic laws, he is bound to assume. This [illegible]itive may be a Frederick Douglass or a William [illegible]lls Brown. No matter by what name he may be known, no matter what may be his specific relations or his particular character, he is a fugitive from the land of slaves. May the Senator, as one bound to support the Constitution, regard him with fraternal feelings? May he recognize him as a man? May he welcome him as a brother?—a brother who was nourished at the breast, essentially, of the same mother; in whose veins his own blood freely flows? He tells us distinctly, he tells us deliberately, he tells us cold-bloodedly, that the Constitution forbids him to assume any such attitude. It requires him, sternly requires him, to regard your Frederick Douglass as a chattel, as a piece of property, that had absconded from its owner; to seize him with a strong hand, and send him back "with alacrity," without compunction or remorse, to the hell of slavery. This is the general position which the Senator assumes in this respect. But I would not do him wrong. Permit me, then (for I do not propose to consume any large amount of your time in such quotations), permit me to read a few lines from this speech, to justify the representation which I have now made:

> "What should be done if the slave should escape into a labor State? Should that State confess him to be a chattel and restore him as such, or might it regard him as a person, and harbor and protect him as a man? They compromised again."

Of course requiring the Senator and all his fellows to assume the position which has already been described. Of course, he regards himself, according to the statement which he here hazards, as solemnly bound to utter an atrocious and suffocating falsehood, for he knows full well that this is not a chattel; that the presence into which he is brought is a human presence; that the creature which looks suppliantly into his face is a man. He knows that there is an essential and vital difference separating, evermore and everywhere separating, personality from property. Of course he feels himself bound to utter, if we may credit the statement which he here makes, not merely lip-wise, but deed-wise, an atrocious and suffocating falsehood; bound to confess that what he knows to be a man is a chattel. And for what purpose is he forced upon a falsehood so enormous, so comprehensive? Why, merely that he may inflict upon his brother the deadliest injury; that he may assail the nature which he has inherited; that he may strike him with deadly steel to the heart of his personality; that he may inflict upon him the most scathing insults and the most unendurable injuries.

But look again for a single moment. The Senator admits that repeatedly, in the history of our country, the safeguards of freedom have been surrendered at the demand of slaveholders. This fact he asserts, but he declares, in the self-same breath, that we may urge on our behalf, in so doing, a virtuous excuse. This is the very language he employs. It is not that we love freedom less, but that we love the Union more. And this he pronounces a virtuous excuse. Now, if it be a virtuous excuse, it is an excuse of virtue; it is virtue in exercise; virtue in manifestation; and wherever the safeguards of freedom have thus been sacrificed, they have been sacrificed in honor of the claims of virtue. Of course, under whatever form, however frequently, and in whatever shape, demands may be urged upon us, we are bound, out of a deep reverence for virtue, to yield to their influence. We are bound to sacrifice the safeguards of freedom. We are bound on this altar to lay our consciences, the best impulses of our nature, whatever is dear in the affections, and whatever may be vital in the prospects of our own brothers. And surely, after we have sacrificed our own personality, after we have sacrificed our own manliness, after we have sacrificed whatever may be the source and ground of self-respect, in obedience to the dictates and demands of a virtue thus described, it will be but a small thing when we are required to give up the personality of our existence, when we are required to welcome the fetters to our heels and the manacles to our limbs.

Now, what is the result of this general position which is here assumed? It is, of course, a false position—grossly, undeniably false; and whoever surveys the objects by which he may be surrounded, and the relations which may attract his attention, from a false position, will, from a sort of stern necessity, arrive at false conclusions. All the various objects which may attract his attention will present themselves under distorted forms and under unnatural relations. Suppose, for instance—if I may venture on your patience so far as to make such a supposition—suppose that, according to the demands of the Constitution of the Republic, we should confess that one-third of the nine digits had no significance; that they resolved themselves into nothing; that they had no value, and were to be regarded, as the boys at school express themselves, as so many noughts. Every man knows, of course, that each of the nine digits sustains a natural and necessary relation to all the various figures and calculations and arrangements which may lie anywhere or anyhow within the entire sphere of arithmetic. Now, if one should take the attitude thus described, I pray you, what reliance could be placed

which he might arrive in this sphere of thought? Of course, it would necessarily be fatal to success in any such attempt. Assuming a position so radically, so vitally false, he cannot claim our confidence in any attempt whatever which he may make. The particular attitude which any man may be expected to assume, in any department of inquiry, in any sphere of thought to which he may be admitted, will as a matter of course, be controlled and modified by the general position where he expends his strength and lays out his resources.

Now, although the hour be late, and though I do not claim to be a wit or a wag, though I am entirely unable, if I may be allowed to consume a few moments of your time, to afford you any large amount of amusement, yet perhaps you will pardon me, since I have ventured to take the position I have assumed, if I advert to a very few of the principal attitudes which, under the general position I have already described, the Senator allows himself to assume.

Mr. Seward is not satisfied—he does not say for what reason—with the somewhat technical terms in which one part of this Republic, in which the monuments of slavery are erected, is distinguished, and has all along been distinguished, from the other part of this Republic, where those monuments do not meet and pain the eye. We used to hear about the slave States and about the free States, and it was generally supposed that this language, in its natural application, all our fellow-citizens understood, and were able readily, and we believed fitly, to apply. I do not know who invented, I only know who adopted the new technical terms which are here introduced. Here are eighteen States set over against fifteen other States. The fifteen States in which slaves are held are here described as capital States; the eighteen States in which they are not held are here described as labor States; and between these two divisions of the Republic, according to Mr. Seward, in language which has been, perhaps, a thousand times repeated, there is, on this very subject, an irrepressible conflict. Of course, Mr. Seward is a metaphysician, Mr. Seward is a philosopher, and, as a matter of course, we should expect that a man who was not satisfied with the technical terms which, for the purpose already specified, had all along been employed, if he introduced to us unusual terms, would select syllables from language so rich in its resources (and with the various terms by which, through its means, thought is expressed, Mr. Seward may be thought to be familiar)—we should expect, I say, that he would select those syllables which fitly, which aptly describe the thing signified. Now, then, we ask, is labor in "irrepressible conflict" with capital? and is capital hostile to labor? I had thought, for one, that labor was the natural source of capital: that they were very nearly akin to each other, if they were not different phases or descriptions of the self-same entity. Suppose that this speech, with which I am now attempting for a little to occupy your attention, should fall under the eye of one of our fellows in a foreign land who had formed some little acquaintance with our history, and felt within himself a strong impulse to understand more clearly and fully whatever might belong to our institutions. He is assured, on authority which he respects, that Wm. H. Seward is a heroic spirit, that he is a great man, that he is a deep thinker, that he is a distinguished statesman, and that, in the view of the friends of freedom, to a very great extent, he is regarded as our natural ruler. Now, when he marked, with open eyes, these technical terms, thus introduced, to what inference, I pray you, would he be forced? Would he not, as a matter of course, suppose that in the capital States larger resources were brought into requisition, in promoting the great ends of human activity? Would he not suppose that here were to be found our Rothschilds, that here large resources had been accumulated, and that the labor States were specially dependent upon the capital States for the means to prosecute those enterprises to which, in the sphere of business and commerce, they might be devoted? Would not that, I pray you, be the natural inference? Would it not fasten itself inevitably upon his mind?

Now, supposing ourselves in his position, it may not be amiss to inquire for a moment what are the characteristic elements which enter into the composition, if I may so speak, of those capital States? You have, in the first place, as a leading element, some four millions of human beings, who are pronounced utterly incapable, in the solemn language of the law, of acquiring capital under any form or name. They have no claims which are acknowledged, no claims to the very instrumentalities connected with the human organization through which capital may naturally be sought and accumulated. Then, you have, in addition to this, as another element here to be recognized and brought into the calculation, about an equal number of men and women, who bear the very significant name, all over the Republic, of "poor whites." What may be their condition, I need not pause to describe. One single expression which, we are told, is frequently on the lips of the slaves themselves, will answer, as my time is rapidly passing, for a more particular description. They are called "the poor white trash," and are looked upon by the enslaved, we are told, now with pity and now with contempt. The remaining element entering into the composition of the capital States may be very easily described—and I confine myself to facts—I intend to confine myself to facts, notorious facts, undeniable facts. I did not construct those facts. They are not the product of my fancy; they are not the creation of my imagination; and he must, indeed, be twice and four times a dastard who dares not look the facts in his own country's history, the facts which belong to its condition, fully, fairly and resolutely in the face (applause). The remaining element, then, consists of some three or four hundred thousand persons who have never paid their own cook or washerwoman, who have found it very difficult, if not impossible, to support their own post-office arrangements, and who are frequently reduced to such extremities that they take their own sons and daughters and sell them in the open market. That is what some men would call covert cannibalism.

Now, I would ask, with what propriety, for what purpose, are those fifteen States so to be described—so to be described in the Senate of the Republic, on a grave occasion, and by a representative man? It is most manifest that this account of the matter is marked by gross absurdity, and that its entire tendency and influence, on those to whom the Senator addressed himself, must be mischievous and disastrous.

But let us mark another attitude which is here assumed. The Senator, in announcing his views, in inculcating his doctrines on the subject of human equality, manifests a very deep solicitude to impress those by whom he is surrounded with this one conclusion—that he is not in favor of the equality of all men; he is in favor of the equality only of white faces. Those who have given the least heed to the paragraph to which I refer must be well aware that this feature strongly marks his statement. I would like to inquire what is the natural foundation on which human equality reposes? We are told by some shallow, stolid, so-called statesmen, that the declaration which we find in the great document to which we so often refer, asserting that all men are created equal, is in conflict with facts. All men, they declare, are not equal. All this is manifest and undeniable. Now, those who formed the Declaration of Independence understood this as well as their calumniators. They knew that, measured by the yard-stick, all men were not incidentally equal. They knew that, as weighed on the scales, all men were not incidentally equal. They knew that men differed incidentally from each other in the intellectual elements by which they were respectively distinguished. They knew very well that some had a vigorous and gigantic will, and that others were comparatively irresolute. All this they knew, and this they never dreamed of denying. But they did affirm, and they were justified in affirming, that all men have inherited the self-same nature; that a common manhood lay at the basis of our existence; that one great human heart beat in all our bosoms; that the blood which flowed in our veins gushed from the same source, and was distinguished by the same qualities; and they affirmed, therefore, the doctrine of human equality—that is, that all men, as having inherited human nature, were qualified to make themselves, to the full extent of their opportunities, intensely, grandly, beautifully human; that all men, one in common with another, had an equal right, each one in his place, to make the most of his own existence, and to rise to the highest point of excellence and of blessedness to which his capabilities might lift him; that all men equally, one with another, were entitled to the opportunity to secure the highest and best development of those powers which were lodged in the depths of their being. That is what they affirmed, broadly, grandly affirmed.

Now, then, I would like to know if the complexion of any man's face is not an incident, and, so far as he is concerned, it is merely an accident, since he was not consulted in the matter, and had here no agency. If my complexion be at all to be preferred, for any purpose, to the complexion of my next neighbor, very surely that cannot be regarded as to my credit or advantage. It is a mere incident—an incident lying almost within the range of accident. To make a mere accident, in opposition to human nature, to make the mere incident of a white face, the basis of the equality on which the great Senator pleads, and to call that equality "human," without any reference to that which makes any creature human—well, I should be apt to think, if I was speaking of a name that was repeated with less respect and veneration, that it was a little ridiculous, and indicated I know not what state of mind. Very clearly, the doctrine of human equality lies on this broad basis—a basis on which men of all complexions and all opinions, under all various circumstances in which our manhood may be found, stand up side by side, in which, therefore, they

This broad attitude, again, of course grow
the general position which the Senator has
It is not, of course, to be wondered at that h
give up the enslaved, without uttering
their behalf, absolutely to the control of
hold them as property. He bids th
dispose of their human chattels just as
declares that he has no objection to mak
than that, that he has no distrust in th
distrust to qualify in any measure the ass
he urges; and then, having afforded this
ance, he gives them distinctly to unders
they were to take advantage of the assuran
affords to insult, to outrage and to inflict such
upon their slaves as shall be unbearable
them to rise in insurrection, that he, with
(for he speaks here in the name of his par
defend them. You will permit me, for it w
but very little time, just to read a portion
graph to which I have ventured to advert

> "But we do not seek to enforce or even to i
> upon you. We are justly excluded, wisely and con
> from all political power and responsibility. [illegible]
> he here employs!) In your capital States, yo
> the subject of slavery within your own borde
> same subject within our borders. It is well an
> Use your authority to maintain what system yo
> not distrustful of the result. If our autho[illegible]ty sta
> within or without by any enemy, or for any cause
> have need, we shall expect you to defend us. Now
> shall be so assailed, in the emergency, no matter wha
> the pretext, or who the foe, we shall defend your au
> equivalent of our own."

Now, what sort of a system those w
especially addressing had all along [illegible]
tain, Mr. Seward knew full well. He k
what injuries were inflicted, what insult
liberally all around. He knew full w
agencies and appliances everything human
tling entering into the personality of
oppressed fellows, was stricken down and
He bids them maintain the same system
and multiply murders, rapes; every form
humanity may be assailed can be
and multiply these, under whatever form
prefer: alter your system according
according to your convenience, accord
caprice: make the burdens which you
upon the shoulders of your human cha
it be possible, and render their lives
gloomy and perilous than you have
lives hitherto. We have no distrust of
have not a word to utter, no objection
advice to offer. We have no sympath
whom you may fasten your hand. The
they may groan, they may struggle in th
death, it is no concern of ours. We have
bility whatever within the States where t
fined."

It seems to be very remarkable that a m
pledge himself, in behalf of those whom he
to uphold his fellows in pursuing a course
may prefer where he himself has no re
whatever! I thought that power and res
always travelled hand in hand, and that ou
bilities were always to be measured by t
we wielded. He must be very eager, it s
with his party at his heels, to bring stee
into requisition, who urges himself into a s
employ these instruments of death where
that he has no responsibility whatever.

One other thing. Mr. Seward could not
be content, without bringing John Brown
judgment. He must gratuitously and e
pronounce anew upon him sentence of dea
Brown had been convicted, he had been stra
hallowed remains, by true and devoted men,
borne far away from the scene where he end
trial and the suffering which opened the way
scenes of his labor and exposure; and as
remains, so hallowed and cherished, were borne
through village after village of the North, gra
reverend men, uncovered their heads, and
to the remains of the mighty dead. He was
away, as it was meet he should be, and his
were laid among the stern but true and ma
rocks that lift themselves up in the presence
Champlain. There it was supposed they w
securely. Now, it is affirmed in this speech
death of John Brown—and John Brown, o
not only represents himself, but his associates
"necessary and just." "Necessary"—for
pray you? Necessary, of course, if necessary
to maintain that system of outrage and cruel
had all along been upheld. Necessary for th
pose of subserving ends which humanity
shudders to contemplate. But it is said he
was "just." This I deny. I deny it in th
of great justice, in the name of the ordina
nature, in the name of all that is sacred
sphere of high sovereignty. "Necessary an
Let me ask for what alleged crimes he was e
You may say, if you please, for the crime of
What, then, is the character of this crime
are the elements of which civil government
rally composed? What are the materials of w
is constructed? It is made up of certain p
immutable, all-comprehensive, that bind ev
that is and lives into one mass—a sublime
These principles are all embodied and pres
the grand precept which John Brown wrote
heart, to which he adjusted himself in his aims
methods, and exertions—the principle of dis
benevolence, the principle of equal, imparti
the principle embodied and presented in that
which we well describe as "the Golden Rule.
rule comprehends order; this rule comprehen
tice; this rule comprehends whatever may
scribed as human rights, as human prer
These are the materials of which government
where, from the most retired nursery in the
upward to the highest heaven, is constructed.
are its essential and vital elements. Where
are, there is government. Wherever these a
government cannot exist. There is nothing
deserving the name, there is nothing there
the influence, there is nothing there which
the homage which is due to civil governme
any name, or form, or modification; and
universe through, he who is most distinguis
regard, his unyielding and consistent regard
principles, who embodies them most fully
cally and beautifully in his character, who
most promptly and earnestly to them in his
hearts, who embodies them in his own h
who is most distinguished for those attain
those achievements, is a God-annointed ru
ever he may be, whatever may be the disp
his circle, of what people call the elective
whatever may be the decision of the ma
impossible for any power in the world, in
compass of thought and exertion, it is impos
any power to pluck the diadem from his
the sceptre from his hand. He is God's o
and shall be honored in due time, and in
able circumstances, under that character
And, whatever may bear the name of
ment, wherever these sacred principles are
violated, wherever justice is trampled
wherever our common humanity is set at no
you have nothing, whatever may be the orga
whatever arrangements, whatever usages
at best nothing but organized anarchy.
and all those who are connected with what
be described make themselves, as God liv
That every philosopher who thinks—an
phers think—on this subject will tell y
make yourself an outlaw. When you ref
yourself of the benefits which law brings
reach, how can law protect you? How c
its natural blessings, the rich blessings w
is pregnant upon you, when you refuse
or socially, to adjust yourself to its sovereign
I say, then, that, throughout the wh
slavery, wherever humanity is trampled
wherever the demands of awful, yet beni
are ignored or resisted, there is, there can
thing as treason. It cannot, under such c
be committed. From the very nature of t
outlaw is one of whom any fellow w
disposes of according to his discretion, a
his convenience.

Now, then, John Brown could not, if he
intent on this thing, have committed treas
the limits of Virginia, for the plain reaso
ginia herself is an outlaw (loud applause
its appropriate character. It tramples upo
ruthlessly, and deliberately on the elements
It ignores or resists whatever may be a
its character and its influence. It was J
for we are well informed of his characte
have received our information from all quarte
foes as well as friends—it was John Brow
the crown, if I may use such a symbol, an
sceptre. He was under the catholic influence
Golden Rule, which is a comprehensive desc
all law and of all government. His was a g
his a heroic spirit. He was distinguished
magnanimity, for his intrepidity, for his da
his deep-toned, yearning regard for all those w
inherited our common nature. All this is ad
both by friends and foes. How, then in the na
all consistency—how, in the name of all the gr
letters which appear in those horn-books whi
study whenever we would make ourselves fa
with the elements of the great art and science
vernment, could the death of John Brown be desc
as just, I beseech you? "Just," when outlaws
upon him, when outlaws sought his blood
were outlaws who strangled him—men who tra
upon every thing sacred in legislation—men
ignored or scorned every characteristic by which
government, under its own appropriate name, is
where above or below, distinguished! (Appl
All this is undeniable; these conclusions are